

EDULAB

European Youth in Transition to
Education and Labour



www.edu-lab-project.eu

Design, Implementation and Outcomes of the First Two Rounds of OSES-Delphi and Design of Research Tools for the Concluding Rounds

Volume Two (the Quantitative Report) – this document

Volumes One, Three and Four will be published on EDU-LAB web separately

Deliverable number and title: D3.5 “Outcomes of the first two rounds of OSES, design of research tools for the concluding rounds”

Preceding Deliverable: D3.4 “Terms of Reference for the Design and Implementation of the Online Survey of Experts and Stakeholders (OSES)”
(produced on 30 June 2025)

Due date: 30 June 2026

Nature: R = Report

Dissemination Level: PU = Public

Work Package: WP3B (OSES - International expert survey)

Lead Beneficiary: Economica

Contributing Beneficiaries: All project partners

Authors: Alexander Chvorostov, Daniel Helmenstein, Claudia Palt, et al.



Funded by
the European Union

A Horizon Europe collaborative project (2025-2027)
Grant Agreement #101177428

Disclaimer:

The content of this deliverable reflects only the authors' view. The European Commission and its Research Executive Agency are not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Purpose and scope of the deliverable

This volume is the quantitative companion to the OSES-Delphi Text Report. It presents the descriptive results of Wave 1 in tabular form: the composition of the expert sample and, for each of the 30 trend statements, the full rating distributions together with central-tendency and dispersion measures. Following the close of the Wave 2 field phase (10 June 2026, 18:00), the volume also contains the final Wave 2 results (Section 4), the Wave 1 ↔ Wave 2 comparison (Section 5) and the within-respondent matched-sample analyses (Section 6), all based on the final Wave 2 analysis dataset of N = 207.

Document history

Version	Date	Description
0.1	06 June 2026	Initial draft (Daniel Helmenstein) (circulated within the Economica team members)
0.2	10 June 2026	Final Wave 2 dataset integrated (N = 207; field closed 18:00): Sections 4 and 5 final; new Sections 5.3 (per-country convergence) and 6 (matched-sample analyses) added (Daniel Helmenstein)
0.3	22 June 2026	Reworked and finalized by Economica team
1.0 (final)	26 June 2026	Approved by PMB and the Coordinator

List of project-specific terms and abbreviations

CEDEFOP	The European Centre for the Development of Professional Training (an EU Agency)
DPA	Data-Processing Agreement
ECEC	Early Childhood Education and Care
EDU-LAB	The EU-funded project “European Youth in Transition to Education and Labour”
EEA	European Education Area
EEI	Exploratory Expert Interview
ETF	European Training Foundation
GE	General education
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
IQR	Inter-Quartile Range (Q3 – Q1)
ISCED	International Standard Classification of Education
Md	Median
OSES	International Online Survey of Experts and Stakeholders (the WP3B policy Delphi)
PMB	Project Management Board
PVET	Technical and Vocational Education and Training
SD	Standard deviation
TVET	Professional and vocational education and training
WP	Work package
W1 / W2	Wave 1 / Wave 2 of the Delphi; S01–S30 = statement codes

Codes for EDU-LAB target countries

FI Finland	IT Italy	UK the United Kingdom
AT Austria	GR Greece	PL Poland
XK Kosovo	PT Portugal	DE Germany

Table of Contents

1 Methodological notes for the tables	6
1.1 Analysis dataset and case selection	6
1.2 Response scales	6
1.3 Statistics and conventions	6
1.4 Per-country reporting	6
1.5 Statement inventory (30 statements, Wave 1)	6
2 Sample description (Wave 1, N = 433)	8
2.1 Geographic distribution	8
2.2 Gender	8
2.3 Age 8	
2.4 Highest level of education (ISCED-2011)	9
2.5 Major field of highest education (ISCED-F)	9
2.6 Stakeholder structure	9
2.7 Self-assessed expertise by theme	11
2.8 Geographic scope of expertise	12
2.9 Willingness to participate in Wave 2	12
3 Statement results — Wave 1	12
3.1 Theme A: Education and Training	12
S01 · Double competencies (disciplinary plus IT) will become a universal employment requirement	12
S02 · Illiteracy after eight or nine years of schooling will be the norm	13
S03 · The COVID-19 crisis will have long-term impacts on learning behaviour and abilities for young people	14
S04 · Schools will implement effective programs to address behavioral problems (e.g.: violence, bullying, disengagement)	14
S05 · Public investment in early childhood education will become the most critical part of education	15
S06 · Education will diversify through vocational pathways that promote specific skills over standardized education	16
S07 · Focus on university education will neglect TVET (Technical and Vocational Education and Training)	16
S08 · Society's status preference for universities over vocational training will persist	17
3.2 Theme B: Labour Market and Employment	17
S09 · New career entry pathways will emerge as AI transforms traditional employment routes	18
S10 · Work experience requirements for entry-level positions will become more prevalent	18
S11 · Overqualification will increase due to the growing number of academic qualifications	19
S12 · Lack of affordable childcare will prevent young parents' labor participation	19
S13 · Young people will be first to be fired and last to be hired during downturns	20
S14 · The gap between employer expectations for skilled workers and employer participation in training provision will widen	21
S15 · Ageing workforce will create massive talent demand in certain sectors	21
3.3 Theme C: Transitions and Systemic Interfaces	22
S16 · Mental health challenges among youth stemming from the COVID-19 crisis will continue to affect life skills	22
S17 · Media and Influencers will significantly influence student program choices	22

S18 · The transition from education to employment will become more unstable and fragmented for many young people.....	23
S19 · Extended juvenile phase will hinder workplace engagement.....	24
S20 · Schools will increasingly adapt curricula to emerging occupations and career paths	24
S21 · Social partnerships between education, the private sector and academia will be widely formed	25
S22 · Education and labour market policies will struggle to effectively govern young people's transition	25
S23 · Integrated guidance centers for youth employment will be widely established	26
3.4 Theme D: Inclusion and Disadvantage	27
S24 · Educational inequalities will exacerbate social polarization and segregation	27
S25 · Resource inequities between public and private schools will widen	27
S26 · Social class (socio-economic background) will continue to determine educational opportunities	28
S27 · Initiatives breaking gender stereotypes will open previously male-dominated career pathways to women.....	29
S28 · School system reliance on parental help will disadvantage non-native and low-education families	29
S29 · Digital infrastructure and remote learning will reduce regional disparities between urban and rural education.....	30
S30 · Minority ethnic and racial groups of young people will face intensified discrimination.....	30
4 Statement results — Wave 2 (final, N = 207)	31
4.1 Note on Wave 1 ↔ Wave 2 linkage	31
4.2 Block 1 — Controversial statements (re-rated on all four Wave 1 dimensions)	32
S02 · Illiteracy after eight or nine years of schooling will be the norm.....	32
S07 · Focus on university education will neglect TVET (Technical and Vocational Education and Training)	33
4.3 Block 2 — Statements with diverging expert views (re-rated on Importance and Likelihood 5 yrs).....	33
S01 · Double competencies (disciplinary plus IT) will become a universal employment requirement ...	33
S05 · Public investment in early childhood education will become the most critical part of education	34
S13 · Young people will be first to be fired and last to be hired during downturns	34
S16 · Mental health challenges among youth stemming from the COVID-19 crisis will continue to affect life skills	35
S17 · Media and Influencers will significantly influence student program choices	35
S21 · Social partnerships between education, the private sector and academia will be widely formed	36
S23 · Integrated guidance centers for youth employment will be widely established	37
S29 · Digital infrastructure and remote learning will reduce regional disparities between urban and rural education.....	37
4.4 Block 3 — Statements with expert uncertainty (new items: agreement with group result; own certainty)	38
S18 · The transition from education to employment will become more unstable and fragmented for many young people.....	38
S25 · Resource inequities between public and private schools will widen	38

S28 · School system reliance on parental help will disadvantage non-native and low-education families	39
4.5 Block 4 — Consensus statements, optional deepening (new item: feasibility of policy implementation)	39
S03 · The COVID-19 crisis will have long-term impacts on learning behaviour and abilities for young people.....	39
S04 · Schools will implement effective programs to address behavioral problems (e.g.: violence, bullying, disengagement)	40
S09 · New career entry pathways will emerge as AI transforms traditional employment routes	40
S12 · Lack of affordable childcare will prevent young parents' labor participation	41
S14 · The gap between employer expectations for skilled workers and employer participation in training provision will widen	41
S20 · Schools will increasingly adapt curricula to emerging occupations and career paths	42
S24 · Educational inequalities will exacerbate social polarization and segregation	42
S27 · Initiatives breaking gender stereotypes will open previously male-dominated career pathways to women.....	43
4.6 Contributing factors and policy measures (multiple-choice).....	43
5 Wave 1 ↔ Wave 2 comparison	44
5.1 Block 1 — Controversial statements (re-rated on all four Wave 1 dimensions)	45
5.2 Block 2 — Statements with diverging expert views (re-rated on Importance and Likelihood 5 yrs).....	45
5.3 Per-country convergence	45
6 Matched-sample analyses (within-respondent change)	46

1 Methodological notes for the tables

1.1 Analysis dataset and case selection

The Wave 1 field phase ran from 4 March 2026, 08:00 to 10 April 2026, 13:00 (LimeSurvey survey 874769). Questionnaires submitted after the end of the field phase were excluded from the analytical sample, even where they had been completed in full. Within the field phase, 435 fully completed questionnaires were recorded; data cleaning removed 2 records, yielding the final Wave 1 analysis dataset of N = 433. All figures in this volume are based on these 433 cases unless stated otherwise. The same analytical sample (N = 433) underlies the Qualitative Volume.

The Wave 2 field phase ran from 4 May 2026 to the official field close on 10 June 2026, 18:00 (LimeSurvey survey 534732; token-based reassessment of the Wave 1 panel). 231 sessions were started and 207 questionnaires were fully completed and submitted before the field close; no completed questionnaire had to be removed in cleaning, so the final Wave 2 analysis dataset is N = 207. Wave 2 did not re-collect sociodemographic information: country and respondent characteristics derive from the linked Wave 1 record (Sections 4.1 and 6).

1.2 Response scales

Each statement was assessed on five dimensions, each on a five-point ordinal scale plus a non-substantive option "Prefer not to say / don't know / cannot judge" (reported as "Cannot judge"):

- Desirability: 1 = Very undesirable, 2 = Rather undesirable, 3 = Moderate, 4 = Rather desirable, 5 = Very desirable.
- Importance for policymakers, Conflict potential for society, Chances of realization within 5 years, Chances of realization within 15 years: 1 = Very low, 2 = Low, 3 = Moderate, 4 = High, 5 = Very high.

1.3 Statistics and conventions

For every statement × dimension (overall and per project country) the tables report: the number of valid substantive ratings (n); the frequency distribution across the five scale points as count and percentage of valid ratings; the number of "Cannot judge" responses; the median; the inter-quartile range (IQR = Q3 – Q1, quartiles by linear interpolation); the mean; and the standard deviation. "Cannot judge" and item non-response are excluded from the median, IQR, mean and SD, and percentages are computed on the valid (1–5) base. As a reading aid for the consensus discussion in the Text Report, an IQR ≤ 1 is conventionally read as expert consensus and an IQR ≥ 2 as marked dissent; this volume reports the IQR values without classifying them. Source (all tables, unless stated otherwise): EDU-LAB Delphi Survey — Wave 1 (N = 433) and Wave 2 (N = 207), Horizon Europe Project EDU-LAB (2025–2027), Grant Agreement No. 101177428. Calculations and data processing by Economica, Institute of Economic Research, Vienna.

1.4 Per-country reporting

Results are broken down for the nine EDU-LAB project countries, each reported individually: Finland, Austria, Kosovo, Italy, Greece, Portugal, the UK, Poland and Germany (ordered by sample size). Respondents from other countries (together n = 26) are retained in all overall figures but are not reported as separate country columns, as the case numbers are too small for meaningful per-country statistics.

1.5 Statement inventory (30 statements, Wave 1)

Table 1. Statement inventory — the 30 Wave 1 trend statements (codes, thematic areas)

Code	Th.	Thematic area	Statement
S01	A	Education and Training	Double competencies (disciplinary plus IT) will become a universal employment requirement
S02	A	Education and Training	Illiteracy after eight or nine years of schooling will be the norm
S03	A	Education and Training	The COVID-19 crisis will have long-term impacts on learning behaviour and abilities for young people
S04	A	Education and Training	Schools will implement effective programs to address behavioral problems (e.g.: violence, bullying, disengagement)

S05	A	Education and Training	Public investment in early childhood education will become the most critical part of education
S06	A	Education and Training	Education will diversify through vocational pathways that promote specific skills over standardized education
S07	A	Education and Training	Focus on university education will neglect TVET (Technical and Vocational Education and Training)
S08	A	Education and Training	Society's status preference for universities over vocational training will persist
S09	B	Labour Market and Employment	New career entry pathways will emerge as AI transforms traditional employment routes
S10	B	Labour Market and Employment	Work experience requirements for entry-level positions will become more prevalent
S11	B	Labour Market and Employment	Overqualification will increase due to the growing number of academic qualifications
S12	B	Labour Market and Employment	Lack of affordable childcare will prevent young parents' labor participation
S13	B	Labour Market and Employment	Young people will be first to be fired and last to be hired during downturns
S14	B	Labour Market and Employment	The gap between employer expectations for skilled workers and employer participation in training provision will widen
S15	B	Labour Market and Employment	Ageing workforce will create massive talent demand in certain sectors
S16	C	Transitions and Systemic Interfaces	Mental health challenges among youth stemming from the COVID-19 crisis will continue to affect life skills
S17	C	Transitions and Systemic Interfaces	Media and Influencers will significantly influence student program choices
S18	C	Transitions and Systemic Interfaces	The transition from education to employment will become more unstable and fragmented for many young people
S19	C	Transitions and Systemic Interfaces	Extended juvenile phase will hinder workplace engagement
S20	C	Transitions and Systemic Interfaces	Schools will increasingly adapt curricula to emerging occupations and career paths
S21	C	Transitions and Systemic Interfaces	Social partnerships between education, the private sector and academia will be widely formed
S22	C	Transitions and Systemic Interfaces	Education and labour market policies will struggle to effectively govern young people's transition
S23	C	Transitions and Systemic Interfaces	Integrated guidance centers for youth employment will be widely established
S24	D	Inclusion and Disadvantage	Educational inequalities will exacerbate social polarization and segregation
S25	D	Inclusion and Disadvantage	Resource inequities between public and private schools will widen
S26	D	Inclusion and Disadvantage	Social class (socio-economic background) will continue to determine educational opportunities
S27	D	Inclusion and Disadvantage	Initiatives breaking gender stereotypes will open previously male-dominated career pathways to women
S28	D	Inclusion and Disadvantage	School system reliance on parental help will disadvantage non-native and low-education families
S29	D	Inclusion and Disadvantage	Digital infrastructure and remote learning will reduce regional disparities between urban and rural education
S30	D	Inclusion and Disadvantage	Minority ethnic and racial groups of young people will face intensified discrimination

2 Sample description (Wave 1, N = 433)

2.1 Geographic distribution

Distribution of the 433 respondents by country of residence. The nine EDU-LAB project countries (flagged ●) are reported individually throughout this volume; remaining countries are grouped here only.

Table 2. Sample description — Geographic distribution (Wave 1, N = 433)

Country	ISO	n	%
● Finland	FI	71	16.4%
● Austria	AT	58	13.4%
● Kosovo	XK	55	12.7%
● Italy	IT	47	10.9%
● Greece	GR	38	8.8%
● Portugal	PT	38	8.8%
● The UK	GB	36	8.3%
● Poland	PL	34	7.9%
● Germany	DE	30	6.9%
Other	-oth-	7	1.6%
Belgium	BE	4	0.9%
France	FR	4	0.9%
Spain	ES	2	0.5%
Bulgaria	BG	2	0.5%
Norway	NO	1	0.2%
Hungary	HU	1	0.2%
Turkey	TR	1	0.2%
The Netherlands	NL	1	0.2%
Czechia	CZ	1	0.2%
Latvia	LV	1	0.2%
Luxembourg	LU	1	0.2%

Project countries (●) total n = 407; other countries total n = 26.

2.2 Gender

Table 3. Sample description — Gender (Wave 1, N = 433)

Category	Total (N=433)	Finland (71)	Austria (58)	Kosovo (55)	Italy (47)	Greece (38)	Portugal (38)	the UK (36)	Poland (34)	Germany (30)
Female	242 (55.9%)	46 (64.8%)	33 (56.9%)	20 (36.4%)	23 (48.9%)	21 (55.3%)	27 (71.1%)	20 (55.6%)	28 (82.4%)	16 (53.3%)
Male	179 (41.3%)	21 (29.6%)	23 (39.7%)	34 (61.8%)	23 (48.9%)	17 (44.7%)	11 (28.9%)	14 (38.9%)	5 (14.7%)	14 (46.7%)
Prefer not to say	12 (2.8%)	4 (5.6%)	2 (3.4%)	1 (1.8%)	1 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (5.6%)	1 (2.9%)	0 (0.0%)
Valid responses	433	71	58	55	47	38	38	36	34	30

2.3 Age

Table 4. Sample description — Age (Wave 1, N = 433)

Statistic	Total (N=433)	Finland (71)	Austria (58)	Kosovo (55)	Italy (47)	Greece (38)	Portugal (38)	the UK (36)	Poland (34)	Germany (30)
n (age given)	391	67	51	47	45	34	34	29	33	27
Missing / no answer	42	4	7	8	2	4	4	7	1	3
Mean	49.4	49.8	47.5	46.3	50.8	51.5	51.3	51.7	44.2	51.1
Median	50	51	47	49	50	52.5	52.5	53	44	54
SD	10.8	10.6	11.7	11.4	9.4	9.2	10.1	11.9	8.2	11.1

Min	19	26	29	19	29	28	29	26	29	25
Max	71	65	69	66	71	65	68	69	65	68
Age <30	14	4	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1
Age 30–39	65	8	15	12	4	1	6	3	8	3
Age 40–49	109	18	11	11	17	12	4	8	16	7
Age 50–59	118	23	12	15	13	10	16	8	6	8
Age 60+	85	14	12	7	10	10	7	9	1	8

Age in completed years. Bands computed on plausible values (15–100); in Wave 1 all given ages fall in 19–71.

2.4 Highest level of education (ISCED-2011)

Table 5. Sample description — Highest level of education (ISCED-2011) (Wave 1, N = 433)

Category	Total (N=433)	Finland (71)	Austria (58)	Kosovo (55)	Italy (47)	Greece (38)	Portugal (38)	the UK (36)	Poland (34)	Germany (30)
Upper secondary / post-secondary non-tertiary education (ISCED 3–)	9 (2.1%)	3 (4.2%)	2 (3.4%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (8.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Tertiary education – Bachelor or equivalent (ISCED 5)	48 (11.1%)	7 (9.9%)	4 (6.9%)	7 (12.7%)	4 (8.5%)	4 (10.5%)	9 (23.7%)	10 (27.8%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (6.7%)
Tertiary education – Master, Doctorate or equivalent (ISCED 7)	376 (86.8%)	61 (85.9%)	52 (89.7%)	48 (87.3%)	39 (83.0%)	34 (89.5%)	29 (76.3%)	26 (72.2%)	34 (100.0%)	28 (93.3%)
Valid responses	433	71	58	55	47	38	38	36	34	30

2.5 Major field of highest education (ISCED-F)

Reported overall (case numbers per field are small at country level).

Table 6. Sample description — Major field of highest education (ISCED-F) (Wave 1, N = 433)

Field of education (ISCED-F)	n	%
Generic programmes and qualifications (ISCED-F: 00) [this includes basic compulsory levels of primary and/or secondary education, such as literacy and numeracy, as well as other individual skills, etc.]	2	0.5%
Education (ISCED-F: 01) [e.g. education sciences, pedagogy, teachers' training, etc]	119	27.5%
Arts, Humanities, Languages (ISCED-F: 02)	48	11.1%
Social Sciences, Journalism and Information (ISCED-F: 03)	119	27.5%
Business, Administration and Law (ISCED-F: 04)	78	18.0%
Natural Sciences, Mathematics and Statistics (ISCED-F: 05)	25	5.8%
Information and Communication Technologies (ISCED-F: 06)	12	2.8%
Engineering, Manufacturing and Construction (ISCED-F: 07)	13	3.0%
Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and Veterinary (ISCED-F: 08)	5	1.2%
Health and Welfare (ISCED-F: 09) [e.g. medicine, nursing, midwifery, pharmacy, care of elderly and disable persons, etc.]	9	2.1%
Prefer not to say	3	0.7%
Valid responses	433	100%

2.6 Stakeholder structure

Primary stakeholder affiliation (single choice), by country.

Table 7. Sample description — Stakeholder structure (Wave 1, N = 433)

Category	Total (N=433)	Finland (71)	Austria (58)	Kosovo (55)	Italy (47)	Greece (38)	Portugal (38)	the UK (36)	Poland (34)	Germany (30)
----------	---------------	--------------	--------------	-------------	------------	-------------	---------------	-------------	-------------	--------------

... primarily employed in public authorities and governance (at all levels, from national to municipal)	84 (19.4%)	19 (26.8%)	8 (13.8%)	13 (23.6%)	6 (12.8%)	11 (28.9%)	8 (21.1%)	2 (5.6%)	7 (20.6%)	8 (26.7%)
... primarily employed in business and private sector actors and stakeholders (e.g. employers, production sector chambers, trade unions, investors)	62 (14.3%)	18 (25.4%)	11 (19.0%)	4 (7.3%)	11 (23.4%)	3 (7.9%)	3 (7.9%)	4 (11.1%)	4 (11.8%)	3 (10.0%)
... primarily employed as teaching and/or administrative staff in the education and training institutions	111 (25.6%)	14 (19.7%)	9 (15.5%)	21 (38.2%)	13 (27.7%)	10 (26.3%)	12 (31.6%)	16 (44.4%)	9 (26.5%)	2 (6.7%)
... primarily engaged with civil society organizations, NGOs and/or media involved in aspects of youth life	26 (6.0%)	10 (14.1%)	2 (3.4%)	8 (14.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (5.3%)	2 (5.6%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.3%)
... primarily employed in research and academia, universities, consultancies	115 (26.6%)	7 (9.9%)	24 (41.4%)	5 (9.1%)	12 (25.5%)	9 (23.7%)	10 (26.3%)	9 (25.0%)	13 (38.2%)	16 (53.3%)
... primarily employed in European or international coordination and development organizations	10 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.7%)	1 (1.8%)	1 (2.1%)	2 (5.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
... primarily retired	9 (2.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.8%)	3 (6.4%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.6%)	2 (5.6%)	1 (2.9%)	0 (0.0%)
None of the above	16 (3.7%)	3 (4.2%)	3 (5.2%)	2 (3.6%)	1 (2.1%)	3 (7.9%)	2 (5.3%)	1 (2.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Valid responses	433	71	58	55	47	38	38	36	34	30

Sub-roles within each principal stakeholder cluster (asked conditionally; reported overall).

Cluster A:

Table 8. Sample description — Stakeholder structure, continued (Wave 1, N = 433)

Sub-role	n	% of cluster
... primarily employed in governance or public authorities at national, regional (provincial), or municipal levels including both legislative and executive branches that are involved in the governance, financing, and/or administration of educational and training settings for youth aged 15-30	60	71.4%
... primarily employed in labour market services or agencies	10	11.9%
... primarily employed in accreditation and/or certification agencies in general or professional education and training	5	6.0%
Other	9	10.7%

Cluster B:

Table 9. Sample description — Stakeholder structure, continued (Wave 1, N = 433)

Sub-role	n	% of cluster
... primarily employed in production sector chambers (industrial, service, agriculture)	16	25.8%
... primarily employed in employers' associations or their unions	14	22.6%
... primarily employed in trade unions and associations of employees	10	16.1%
... primarily employed with private investors, system sponsors, and charitable organizations active in general or professional education and training of youth	9	14.5%
Other	13	21.0%

Cluster C:

Table 10. Sample description — Stakeholder structure, continued (Wave 1, N = 433)

Sub-role	n	% of cluster
... primarily employed in a teaching or training role in a setting for general or professional education and training of youth	67	60.4%
... primarily employed in an administrative or technical personnel role in a setting for general or professional education and training of youth	32	28.8%
Other	12	10.8%

Cluster D:

Table 11. Sample description — Stakeholder structure, continued (Wave 1, N = 433)

Sub-role	n	% of cluster
... primarily employed in NGOs and grass-roots organizations actively working with youth	15	57.7%
... primarily employed in youth organizations	6	23.1%
... primarily employed in mass media across a variety of channels and formats	1	3.8%
Other	4	15.4%

Cluster E:

Table 12. Sample description — Stakeholder structure, continued (Wave 1, N = 433)

Sub-role	n	% of cluster
... primarily employed in a researcher role in the field of youth and educational studies (e.g. universities, research institutions, specialized committees in research associations)	97	84.3%
... primarily employed in private head-hunting and HR companies or business consultancies	3	2.6%
Other	15	13.0%

Cluster F:

Table 13. Sample description — Stakeholder structure, continued (Wave 1, N = 433)

Sub-role	n	% of cluster
... primarily employed in the European Commission and its individual Directorates-General, the European Council, the European Parliament, etc.	5	50.0%
... primarily employed in UNESCO, OECD, World Bank, EBRD, or similar organizations	4	40.0%
Other	1	10.0%

2.7 Self-assessed expertise by theme

Respondents rated their own expertise in each of the four thematic areas (overall distribution).

Table 14. Sample description — Self-assessed expertise by theme (Wave 1, N = 433)

Expertise level	A · Education & Training	B · Labour Market	C · Transitions	D · Inclusion
Very low	3 (0.7%)	9 (2.1%)	31 (7.2%)	14 (3.2%)
Low	13 (3.0%)	46 (10.6%)	66 (15.2%)	63 (14.5%)

Moderate	81 (18.7%)	170 (39.3%)	166 (38.3%)	190 (43.9%)
High	181 (41.8%)	136 (31.4%)	101 (23.3%)	116 (26.8%)
Very high	150 (34.6%)	63 (14.5%)	29 (6.7%)	38 (8.8%)
Prefer not to say / don't know / cannot judge	5 (1.2%)	9 (2.1%)	40 (9.2%)	12 (2.8%)

2.8 Geographic scope of expertise

Self-reported geographic scope of expertise per theme (multiple answers possible; counts of respondents selecting each scope).

Table 15. Sample description — Geographic scope of expertise (Wave 1, N = 433)

Scope	A · Education	B · Labour	C · Transitions	D · Inclusion
Local/municipal	120	129	128	146
Regional/provincial	140	159	130	156
National	253	252	225	237
National European	126	97	74	63
International/global	74	41	28	39
Prefer not to say	12	17	64	29

2.9 Willingness to participate in Wave 2

Table 16. Sample description — Willingness to participate in Wave 2 (Wave 1, N = 433)

Category	Total (N=433)	Finland (71)	Austria (58)	Kosovo (55)	Italy (47)	Greece (38)	Portugal (38)	the UK (36)	Poland (34)	Germany (30)
Yes	295 (68.1%)	51 (71.8%)	45 (77.6%)	35 (63.6%)	40 (85.1%)	22 (57.9%)	25 (65.8%)	20 (55.6%)	16 (47.1%)	22 (73.3%)
No	138 (31.9%)	20 (28.2%)	13 (22.4%)	20 (36.4%)	7 (14.9%)	16 (42.1%)	13 (34.2%)	16 (44.4%)	18 (52.9%)	8 (26.7%)
Valid responses	433	71	58	55	47	38	38	36	34	30
Yes and e-mail address provided (re-contactable)	281 (64.9%)	50 (70.4%)	43 (74.1%)	31 (56.4%)	38 (80.9%)	19 (50.0%)	25 (65.8%)	20 (55.6%)	16 (47.1%)	22 (73.3%)

This item indicates the potential Wave 2 panel. Only respondents who ticked "yes" and also left an e-mail address could be invited (281 of 433, 64.9%); the 287 panellists actually invited additionally include eight post-cut-off Wave 1 completers and one manually added participant (Main Report, Section 5.2). Actual Wave 2 participation is reported in Section 4.

3 Statement results — Wave 1

For each statement two tables are given. The first reports, for all five assessment dimensions, the valid n, the full frequency distribution (count and % of valid ratings), the number of "Cannot judge" responses, and the median, IQR, mean and SD (overall, N = 433). The second reports the median and IQR by project country.

3.1 Theme A: Education and Training

Scale 1–5 per dimension. Desirability: 1 = Very undesirable ... 5 = Very desirable. Importance / Conflict / Realization: 1 = Very low ... 5 = Very high. Md = median, IQR = Q3 – Q1, CJ = "Cannot judge". % are of valid ratings.

S01 · Double competencies (disciplinary plus IT) will become a universal employment requirement

Overall (N = 433):

Table 17. S01 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	407	0 (0.0%)	16 (3.9%)	78 (19.2%)	148 (36.4%)	165 (40.5%)	21	4.0	1.00	4.13	0.86
Importance	403	2 (0.5%)	21 (5.2%)	81 (20.1%)	182 (45.2%)	117 (29.0%)	25	4.0	2.00	3.97	0.86
Conflict pot.	365	8 (2.2%)	48 (13.2%)	133 (36.4%)	126 (34.5%)	50 (13.7%)	63	3.0	1.00	3.44	0.96
Realiz. 5 yrs	398	5 (1.3%)	50 (12.6%)	116 (29.1%)	155 (38.9%)	72 (18.1%)	30	4.0	1.00	3.60	0.96
Realiz. 15 yrs	385	5 (1.3%)	17 (4.4%)	58 (15.1%)	133 (34.5%)	172 (44.7%)	43	4.0	1.00	4.17	0.93

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 18. S01 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Austria	58	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Italy	47	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	4.5 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	5.0 (1.00)
Portugal	38	4.5 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	5.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)
Poland	34	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.50)
Germany	30	4.5 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)

S02 · Illiteracy after eight or nine years of schooling will be the norm

Overall (N = 433):

Table 19. S02 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	396	294 (74.2%)	44 (11.1%)	29 (7.3%)	8 (2.0%)	21 (5.3%)	32	1.0	1.00	1.53	1.07
Importance	385	24 (6.2%)	52 (13.5%)	63 (16.4%)	114 (29.6%)	132 (34.3%)	43	4.0	2.00	3.72	1.24
Conflict pot.	378	17 (4.5%)	41 (10.8%)	56 (14.8%)	123 (32.5%)	141 (37.3%)	50	4.0	2.00	3.87	1.16
Realiz. 5 yrs	375	60 (16.0%)	103 (27.5%)	118 (31.5%)	71 (18.9%)	23 (6.1%)	53	3.0	1.50	2.72	1.13
Realiz. 15 yrs	366	44 (12.0%)	96 (26.2%)	105 (28.7%)	71 (19.4%)	50 (13.7%)	62	3.0	2.00	2.96	1.22

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 20. S02 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.50)	3.0 (2.00)
Finland	71	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.5 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)
Austria	58	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.5 (1.00)	2.5 (1.75)	3.0 (2.00)
Kosovo	55	2.0 (2.00)	3.0 (3.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.75)

Italy	47	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)
Greece	38	1.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.75)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Portugal	38	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (3.00)
the UK	36	1.0 (0.50)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	2.0 (1.00)	2.0 (1.00)
Poland	34	1.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Germany	30	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (3.00)	4.0 (2.00)	2.0 (2.50)	2.0 (1.75)

S03 · The COVID-19 crisis will have long-term impacts on learning behaviour and abilities for young people

Overall (N = 433):

Table 21. S03 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	402	199 (49.5%)	98 (24.4%)	63 (15.7%)	22 (5.5%)	20 (5.0%)	26	2.0	2.0 0	1.92	1.15
Importance	408	16 (3.9%)	56 (13.7%)	123 (30.1%)	130 (31.9%)	83 (20.3%)	20	4.0	1.0 0	3.51	1.08
Conflict pot.	401	13 (3.2%)	58 (14.5%)	111 (27.7%)	145 (36.2%)	74 (18.5%)	27	4.0	1.0 0	3.52	1.05
Realiz. 5 yrs	402	23 (5.7%)	61 (15.2%)	107 (26.6%)	147 (36.6%)	64 (15.9%)	26	4.0	1.0 0	3.42	1.10
Realiz. 15 yrs	396	50 (12.6%)	85 (21.5%)	121 (30.6%)	93 (23.5%)	47 (11.9%)	32	3.0	2.0 0	3.00	1.20

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 22. S03 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	2.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)
Finland	71	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)
Austria	58	1.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)
Italy	47	1.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)
Greece	38	2.0 (1.25)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (3.00)
Portugal	38	2.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.25)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	2.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Poland	34	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)
Germany	30	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)

S04 · Schools will implement effective programs to address behavioral problems (e.g.: violence, bullying, disengagement)

Overall (N = 433):

Table 23. S04 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	419	6 (1.4%)	3 (0.7%)	27 (6.4%)	68 (16.2%)	315 (75.2%)	9	5.0	0.0 0	4.63	0.76
Importance	417	3 (0.7%)	15 (3.6%)	70 (16.8%)	154 (36.9%)	175 (42.0%)	11	4.0	1.0 0	4.16	0.88
Conflict pot.	406	4 (1.0%)	42 (10.3%)	68 (16.7%)	141 (34.7%)	151 (37.2%)	22	4.0	2.0 0	3.97	1.02

Realiz. 5 yrs	410	8 (2.0%)	70 (17.1%)	136 (33.2%)	140 (34.1%)	56 (13.7%)	18	3.0	1.0 0	3.40	0.99
Realiz. 15 yrs	398	5 (1.3%)	31 (7.8%)	127 (31.9%)	139 (34.9%)	96 (24.1%)	30	4.0	1.0 0	3.73	0.96

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 24. S04 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	5.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	5.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.25)	4.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Italy	47	5.0 (0.00)	4.5 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	5.0 (0.00)	5.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Portugal	38	5.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.5 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
the UK	36	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Poland	34	5.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.25)	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.50)
Germany	30	5.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.5 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)

S05 · Public investment in early childhood education will become the most critical part of education

Overall (N = 433):

Table 25. S05 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mea n	SD
Desirability	404	20 (5.0%)	32 (7.9%)	70 (17.3%)	96 (23.8%)	186 (46.0%)	24	4.0	2.0 0	3.98	1.18
Importance	409	6 (1.5%)	51 (12.5%)	93 (22.7%)	128 (31.3%)	131 (32.0%)	19	4.0	2.0 0	3.80	1.07
Conflict pot.	389	19 (4.9%)	69 (17.7%)	124 (31.9%)	108 (27.8%)	69 (17.7%)	39	3.0	1.0 0	3.36	1.11
Realiz. 5 yrs	401	24 (6.0%)	91 (22.7%)	152 (37.9%)	88 (21.9%)	46 (11.5%)	27	3.0	2.0 0	3.10	1.07
Realiz. 15 yrs	393	15 (3.8%)	65 (16.5%)	128 (32.6%)	113 (28.8%)	72 (18.3%)	35	3.0	1.0 0	3.41	1.08

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 26. S05 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)
Austria	58	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.25)	3.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Italy	47	3.0 (3.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	4.5 (1.75)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.5 (1.00)
Portugal	38	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.25)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
the UK	36	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Poland	34	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)	2.0 (1.00)	2.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.50)
Germany	30	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.5 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)

S06 · Education will diversify through vocational pathways that promote specific skills over standardized education

Overall (N = 433):

Table 27. S06 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	405	4 (1.0%)	37 (9.1%)	98 (24.2%)	136 (33.6%)	130 (32.1%)	23	4.0	2.0 0	3.87	1.00
Importance	402	2 (0.5%)	30 (7.5%)	108 (26.9%)	167 (41.5%)	95 (23.6%)	26	4.0	1.0 0	3.80	0.90
Conflict pot.	381	13 (3.4%)	70 (18.4%)	152 (39.9%)	106 (27.8%)	40 (10.5%)	47	3.0	1.0 0	3.24	0.98
Realiz. 5 yrs	397	7 (1.8%)	68 (17.1%)	151 (38.0%)	129 (32.5%)	42 (10.6%)	31	3.0	1.0 0	3.33	0.94
Realiz. 15 yrs	389	3 (0.8%)	29 (7.5%)	121 (31.1%)	150 (38.6%)	86 (22.1%)	39	4.0	1.0 0	3.74	0.91

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 28. S06 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	3.0 (1.00)	3.5 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Italy	47	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	4.0 (1.75)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Portugal	38	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	4.0 (1.25)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.50)	3.5 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Poland	34	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Germany	30	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.50)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)

S07 · Focus on university education will neglect TVET (Technical and Vocational Education and Training)

Overall (N = 433):

Table 29. S07 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	394	96 (24.4%)	137 (34.8%)	108 (27.4%)	35 (8.9%)	18 (4.6%)	34	2.0	1.0 0	2.35	1.08
Importance	396	11 (2.8%)	62 (15.7%)	142 (35.9%)	129 (32.6%)	52 (13.1%)	32	3.0	1.0 0	3.38	0.99
Conflict pot.	387	11 (2.8%)	62 (16.0%)	154 (39.8%)	128 (33.1%)	32 (8.3%)	41	3.0	1.0 0	3.28	0.93
Realiz. 5 yrs	386	15 (3.9%)	95 (24.6%)	150 (38.9%)	103 (26.7%)	23 (6.0%)	42	3.0	2.0 0	3.06	0.95
Realiz. 15 yrs	377	14 (3.7%)	92 (24.4%)	142 (37.7%)	97 (25.7%)	32 (8.5%)	51	3.0	2.0 0	3.11	0.99

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 30. S07 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	2.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)
Finland	71	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	2.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)
Kosovo	55	3.0 (1.25)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Italy	47	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	2.5 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.50)
Portugal	38	2.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.75)	3.0 (2.00)
the UK	36	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (0.00)	3.0 (0.75)
Poland	34	2.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.75)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Germany	30	1.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.25)	3.0 (1.25)

S08 · Society's status preference for universities over vocational training will persist

Overall (N = 433):

Table 31. S08 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	404	66 (16.3%)	116 (28.7%)	140 (34.7%)	59 (14.6%)	23 (5.7%)	24	3.0	1.0 0	2.65	1.09
Importance	410	7 (1.7%)	32 (7.8%)	124 (30.2%)	181 (44.1%)	66 (16.1%)	18	4.0	1.0 0	3.65	0.90
Conflict pot.	394	7 (1.8%)	49 (12.4%)	155 (39.3%)	142 (36.0%)	41 (10.4%)	34	3.0	1.0 0	3.41	0.90
Realiz. 5 yrs	395	6 (1.5%)	45 (11.4%)	132 (33.4%)	151 (38.2%)	61 (15.4%)	33	4.0	1.0 0	3.55	0.94
Realiz. 15 yrs	382	11 (2.9%)	37 (9.7%)	148 (38.7%)	136 (35.6%)	50 (13.1%)	46	3.0	1.0 0	3.46	0.94

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 32. S08 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	2.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Austria	58	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Italy	47	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.5 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Portugal	38	3.0 (1.00)	3.5 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)
Poland	34	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Germany	30	2.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)

3.2 Theme B: Labour Market and Employment

Scale 1–5 per dimension. Desirability: 1 = Very undesirable ... 5 = Very desirable. Importance / Conflict / Realization: 1 = Very low ... 5 = Very high. Md = median, IQR = Q3 – Q1, CJ = "Cannot judge". % are of valid ratings.

S09 · New career entry pathways will emerge as AI transforms traditional employment routes

Overall (N = 433):

Table 33. S09 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mea n	SD
Desirability	402	4 (1.0%)	34 (8.5%)	134 (33.3%)	143 (35.6%)	87 (21.6%)	22	4.0	1.0 0	3.68	0.94
Importance	411	0 (0.0%)	18 (4.4%)	56 (13.6%)	180 (43.8%)	157 (38.2%)	13	4.0	1.0 0	4.16	0.82
Conflict pot.	394	3 (0.8%)	15 (3.8%)	88 (22.3%)	173 (43.9%)	115 (29.2%)	30	4.0	2.0 0	3.97	0.86
Realiz. 5 yrs	408	0 (0.0%)	23 (5.6%)	85 (20.8%)	178 (43.6%)	122 (29.9%)	16	4.0	2.0 0	3.98	0.86
Realiz. 15 yrs	394	2 (0.5%)	4 (1.0%)	49 (12.4%)	138 (35.0%)	201 (51.0%)	30	5.0	1.0 0	4.35	0.77

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 34. S09 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	5.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	4.0 (1.50)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)
Italy	47	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	4.0 (0.75)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)
Portugal	38	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	4.0 (2.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)
Poland	34	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)
Germany	30	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	5.0 (1.00)

S10 · Work experience requirements for entry-level positions will become more prevalent

Overall (N = 433):

Table 35. S10 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mea n	SD
Desirability	407	65 (16.0%)	122 (30.0%)	110 (27.0%)	83 (20.4%)	27 (6.6%)	17	3.0	2.0 0	2.72	1.15
Importance	394	6 (1.5%)	37 (9.4%)	132 (33.5%)	166 (42.1%)	53 (13.5%)	30	4.0	1.0 0	3.57	0.89
Conflict pot.	387	6 (1.6%)	42 (10.9%)	121 (31.3%)	151 (39.0%)	67 (17.3%)	37	4.0	1.0 0	3.60	0.95
Realiz. 5 yrs	390	5 (1.3%)	39 (10.0%)	113 (29.0%)	177 (45.4%)	56 (14.4%)	34	4.0	1.0 0	3.62	0.90
Realiz. 15 yrs	379	10 (2.6%)	36 (9.5%)	102 (26.9%)	151 (39.8%)	80 (21.1%)	45	4.0	1.0 0	3.67	1.00

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 36. S10 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
---------	---	--------------	------------	---------------	---------------	----------------

Total (all)	433	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	2.5 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.5 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Italy	47	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Portugal	38	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Poland	34	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.50)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Germany	30	2.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.50)	3.5 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)

S11 · Overqualification will increase due to the growing number of academic qualifications

Overall (N = 433):

Table 37. S11 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	405	76 (18.8%)	150 (37.0%)	122 (30.1%)	37 (9.1%)	20 (4.9%)	19	2.0	1.0 0	2.44	1.05
Importance	403	12 (3.0%)	55 (13.6%)	99 (24.6%)	160 (39.7%)	77 (19.1%)	21	4.0	1.0 0	3.58	1.04
Conflict pot.	395	13 (3.3%)	45 (11.4%)	126 (31.9%)	148 (37.5%)	63 (15.9%)	29	4.0	1.0 0	3.51	1.00
Realiz. 5 yrs	405	10 (2.5%)	53 (13.1%)	110 (27.2%)	173 (42.7%)	59 (14.6%)	19	4.0	1.0 0	3.54	0.98
Realiz. 15 yrs	390	9 (2.3%)	46 (11.8%)	99 (25.4%)	141 (36.2%)	95 (24.4%)	34	4.0	1.0 0	3.69	1.04

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 38. S11 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	2.0 (1.25)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)
Austria	58	2.0 (1.00)	3.5 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.50)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.75)
Italy	47	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.5 (1.00)
Greece	38	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Portugal	38	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.75)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.50)	4.0 (2.75)
Poland	34	2.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Germany	30	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.25)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)

S12 · Lack of affordable childcare will prevent young parents' labor participation

Overall (N = 433):

Table 39. S12 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	403	244 (60.5%)	80 (19.9%)	34 (8.4%)	18 (4.5%)	27 (6.7%)	21	1.0	1.0 0	1.77	1.19
Importance	402	11 (2.7%)	25 (6.2%)	88 (21.9%)	129 (32.1%)	149 (37.1%)	22	4.0	2.0 0	3.94	1.04

Conflict pot.	391	9 (2.3%)	39 (10.0%)	72 (18.4%)	152 (38.9%)	119 (30.4%)	33	4.0	2.0 0	3.85	1.04
Realiz. 5 yrs	391	14 (3.6%)	56 (14.3%)	102 (26.1%)	149 (38.1%)	70 (17.9%)	33	4.0	1.0 0	3.52	1.05
Realiz. 15 yrs	376	15 (4.0%)	47 (12.5%)	101 (26.9%)	132 (35.1%)	81 (21.5%)	48	4.0	1.0 0	3.58	1.08

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 40. S12 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	1.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	2.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	1.0 (0.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.75)	4.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	2.5 (3.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Italy	47	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.50)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	1.0 (2.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.50)	4.0 (1.50)	3.5 (2.00)
Portugal	38	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.50)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Poland	34	1.0 (1.50)	4.0 (2.00)	3.5 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Germany	30	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.75)	4.0 (1.00)

S13 · Young people will be first to be fired and last to be hired during downturns

Overall (N = 433):

Table 41. S13 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	403	197 (48.9%)	129 (32.0%)	53 (13.2%)	14 (3.5%)	10 (2.5%)	21	2.0	1.0 0	1.79	0.97
Importance	397	6 (1.5%)	55 (13.9%)	103 (25.9%)	148 (37.3%)	85 (21.4%)	27	4.0	1.0 0	3.63	1.01
Conflict pot.	395	4 (1.0%)	28 (7.1%)	94 (23.8%)	162 (41.0%)	107 (27.1%)	29	4.0	2.0 0	3.86	0.93
Realiz. 5 yrs	381	8 (2.1%)	62 (16.3%)	116 (30.4%)	139 (36.5%)	56 (14.7%)	43	4.0	1.0 0	3.45	1.00
Realiz. 15 yrs	368	11 (3.0%)	65 (17.7%)	110 (29.9%)	117 (31.8%)	65 (17.7%)	56	3.0	1.0 0	3.44	1.06

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 42. S13 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	1.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	2.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Italy	47	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.50)
Greece	38	2.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.50)	3.0 (2.00)
Portugal	38	2.0 (1.25)	4.0 (1.25)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.25)
the UK	36	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.75)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Poland	34	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Germany	30	1.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.5 (1.25)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.75)

S14 · The gap between employer expectations for skilled workers and employer participation in training provision will widen

Overall (N = 433):

Table 43. S14 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	386	143 (37.0%)	118 (30.6%)	74 (19.2%)	26 (6.7%)	25 (6.5%)	38	2.0	2.0 0	2.15	1.18
Importance	384	10 (2.6%)	38 (9.9%)	115 (29.9%)	151 (39.3%)	70 (18.2%)	40	4.0	1.0 0	3.61	0.98
Conflict pot.	374	7 (1.9%)	53 (14.2%)	123 (32.9%)	142 (38.0%)	49 (13.1%)	50	4.0	1.0 0	3.46	0.95
Realiz. 5 yrs	375	3 (0.8%)	48 (12.8%)	143 (38.1%)	142 (37.9%)	39 (10.4%)	49	3.0	1.0 0	3.44	0.87
Realiz. 15 yrs	362	7 (1.9%)	40 (11.0%)	132 (36.5%)	122 (33.7%)	61 (16.9%)	62	4.0	1.0 0	3.52	0.96

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 44. S14 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	2.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	2.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Italy	47	1.5 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	2.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.5 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Portugal	38	2.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.25)	4.0 (0.50)	4.0 (1.50)
Poland	34	2.0 (1.75)	3.5 (2.00)	3.0 (1.50)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Germany	30	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.25)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)

S15 · Ageing workforce will create massive talent demand in certain sectors

Overall (N = 433):

Table 45. S15 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	375	51 (13.6%)	65 (17.3%)	113 (30.1%)	92 (24.5%)	54 (14.4%)	49	3.0	2.0 0	3.09	1.24
Importance	396	2 (0.5%)	20 (5.1%)	74 (18.7%)	169 (42.7%)	131 (33.1%)	28	4.0	1.0 0	4.03	0.88
Conflict pot.	383	5 (1.3%)	35 (9.1%)	113 (29.5%)	139 (36.3%)	91 (23.8%)	41	4.0	1.0 0	3.72	0.97
Realiz. 5 yrs	390	2 (0.5%)	28 (7.2%)	100 (25.6%)	186 (47.7%)	74 (19.0%)	34	4.0	1.0 0	3.77	0.85
Realiz. 15 yrs	380	2 (0.5%)	16 (4.2%)	74 (19.5%)	134 (35.3%)	154 (40.5%)	44	4.0	1.0 0	4.11	0.90

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 46. S15 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)

Finland	71	3.0 (2.00)	3.5 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (0.75)	4.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.5 (1.00)
Italy	47	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.50)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	3.0 (2.25)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.5 (2.00)
Portugal	38	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	2.0 (1.50)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Poland	34	3.0 (1.75)	4.0 (0.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Germany	30	3.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.75)	4.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)

3.3 Theme C: Transitions and Systemic Interfaces

Scale 1–5 per dimension. Desirability: 1 = Very undesirable ... 5 = Very desirable. Importance / Conflict / Realization: 1 = Very low ... 5 = Very high. Md = median, IQR = Q3 – Q1, CJ = "Cannot judge". % are of valid ratings.

S16 · Mental health challenges among youth stemming from the COVID-19 crisis will continue to affect life skills

Overall (N = 433):

Table 47. S16 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	368	229 (62.2%)	82 (22.3%)	33 (9.0%)	14 (3.8%)	10 (2.7%)	25	1.0	1.0 0	1.62	0.98
Importance	375	13 (3.5%)	50 (13.3%)	87 (23.2%)	131 (34.9%)	94 (25.1%)	18	4.0	1.5 0	3.65	1.10
Conflict pot.	365	10 (2.7%)	40 (11.0%)	82 (22.5%)	157 (43.0%)	76 (20.8%)	28	4.0	1.0 0	3.68	1.01
Realiz. 5 yrs	368	12 (3.3%)	43 (11.7%)	91 (24.7%)	148 (40.2%)	74 (20.1%)	25	4.0	1.0 0	3.62	1.03
Realiz. 15 yrs	362	22 (6.1%)	55 (15.2%)	130 (35.9%)	105 (29.0%)	50 (13.8%)	31	3.0	1.0 0	3.29	1.07

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 48. S16 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.50)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.75)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)
Austria	58	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.50)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)
Kosovo	55	2.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.50)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Italy	47	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	2.0 (1.25)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.50)	3.0 (1.50)
Portugal	38	2.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Poland	34	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.25)	4.0 (1.00)
Germany	30	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (0.50)	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)

S17 · Media and Influencers will significantly influence student program choices

Overall (N = 433):

Table 49. S17 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
-----------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	-----	------	----

Desirability	378	103 (27.2%)	142 (37.6%)	90 (23.8%)	27 (7.1%)	16 (4.2%)	15	2.0	2.0 0	2.23	1.06
Importance	371	13 (3.5%)	32 (8.6%)	101 (27.2%)	150 (40.4%)	75 (20.2%)	22	4.0	1.0 0	3.65	1.01
Conflict pot.	359	8 (2.2%)	40 (11.1%)	108 (30.1%)	126 (35.1%)	77 (21.4%)	34	4.0	1.0 0	3.62	1.01
Realiz. 5 yrs	371	6 (1.6%)	21 (5.7%)	89 (24.0%)	165 (44.5%)	90 (24.3%)	22	4.0	1.0 0	3.84	0.91
Realiz. 15 yrs	359	7 (1.9%)	20 (5.6%)	89 (24.8%)	127 (35.4%)	116 (32.3%)	34	4.0	2.0 0	3.90	0.98

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 50. S17 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	2.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Finland	71	2.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	2.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.75)
Kosovo	55	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.5 (2.00)
Italy	47	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.25)
Greece	38	2.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.25)
Portugal	38	2.0 (1.75)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.75)	4.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	2.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.50)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.50)	4.0 (1.75)
Poland	34	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Germany	30	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)

S18 · The transition from education to employment will become more unstable and fragmented for many young people

Overall (N = 433):

Table 51. S18 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	382	186 (48.7%)	118 (30.9%)	47 (12.3%)	19 (5.0%)	12 (3.1%)	11	2.0	1.0 0	1.83	1.03
Importance	378	8 (2.1%)	25 (6.6%)	91 (24.1%)	139 (36.8%)	115 (30.4%)	15	4.0	2.0 0	3.87	0.99
Conflict pot.	371	3 (0.8%)	18 (4.9%)	78 (21.0%)	178 (48.0%)	94 (25.3%)	22	4.0	2.0 0	3.92	0.85
Realiz. 5 yrs	375	1 (0.3%)	34 (9.1%)	82 (21.9%)	174 (46.4%)	84 (22.4%)	18	4.0	1.0 0	3.82	0.89
Realiz. 15 yrs	358	2 (0.6%)	27 (7.5%)	78 (21.8%)	145 (40.5%)	106 (29.6%)	35	4.0	2.0 0	3.91	0.93

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 52. S18 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Finland	71	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.75)	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	1.5 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.25)	4.0 (2.00)
Kosovo	55	3.0 (3.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Italy	47	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (0.50)	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (0.00)
Greece	38	2.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.25)
Portugal	38	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.50)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)

the UK	36	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.25)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.75)
Poland	34	2.0 (1.75)	4.0 (3.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.75)	4.0 (1.00)
Germany	30	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.75)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.25)

S19 · Extended juvenile phase will hinder workplace engagement

Overall (N = 433):

Table 53. S19 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	353	91 (25.8%)	131 (37.1%)	98 (27.8%)	21 (5.9%)	12 (3.4%)	40	2.0	2.0 0	2.24	1.01
Importance	351	15 (4.3%)	53 (15.1%)	125 (35.6%)	110 (31.3%)	48 (13.7%)	42	3.0	1.0 0	3.35	1.03
Conflict pot.	350	12 (3.4%)	55 (15.7%)	119 (34.0%)	109 (31.1%)	55 (15.7%)	43	3.0	1.0 0	3.40	1.04
Realiz. 5 yrs	350	6 (1.7%)	49 (14.0%)	131 (37.4%)	118 (33.7%)	46 (13.1%)	43	3.0	1.0 0	3.43	0.94
Realiz. 15 yrs	335	7 (2.1%)	45 (13.4%)	102 (30.4%)	122 (36.4%)	59 (17.6%)	58	4.0	1.0 0	3.54	1.00

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 54. S19 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	2.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	2.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	2.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.75)
Italy	47	2.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	2.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Portugal	38	2.0 (2.00)	3.5 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.25)
the UK	36	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Poland	34	2.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Germany	30	2.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.25)	3.0 (1.25)

S20 · Schools will increasingly adapt curricula to emerging occupations and career paths

Overall (N = 433):

Table 55. S20 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	378	9 (2.4%)	33 (8.7%)	58 (15.3%)	120 (31.7%)	158 (41.8%)	15	4.0	2.0 0	4.02	1.07
Importance	377	4 (1.1%)	24 (6.4%)	89 (23.6%)	151 (40.1%)	109 (28.9%)	16	4.0	2.0 0	3.89	0.93
Conflict pot.	360	12 (3.3%)	66 (18.3%)	137 (38.1%)	96 (26.7%)	49 (13.6%)	33	3.0	1.0 0	3.29	1.02
Realiz. 5 yrs	376	11 (2.9%)	59 (15.7%)	147 (39.1%)	114 (30.3%)	45 (12.0%)	17	3.0	1.0 0	3.33	0.97
Realiz. 15 yrs	366	3 (0.8%)	34 (9.3%)	119 (32.5%)	128 (35.0%)	82 (22.4%)	27	4.0	1.0 0	3.69	0.95

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 56. S20 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.25)
Italy	47	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (0.25)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	4.0 (2.00)	4.5 (1.25)	3.0 (1.50)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Portugal	38	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.5 (1.25)	4.0 (1.25)
the UK	36	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Poland	34	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.75)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Germany	30	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)

S21 · Social partnerships between education, the private sector and academia will be widely formed

Overall (N = 433):

Table 57. S21 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	371	3 (0.8%)	14 (3.8%)	50 (13.5%)	116 (31.3%)	188 (50.7%)	22	5.0	1.00	4.27	0.89
Importance	373	4 (1.1%)	20 (5.4%)	91 (24.4%)	148 (39.7%)	110 (29.5%)	20	4.0	2.00	3.91	0.92
Conflict pot.	356	36 (10.1%)	96 (27.0%)	109 (30.6%)	78 (21.9%)	37 (10.4%)	37	3.0	2.00	2.96	1.15
Realiz. 5 yrs	370	8 (2.2%)	52 (14.1%)	143 (38.6%)	127 (34.3%)	40 (10.8%)	23	3.0	1.00	3.38	0.93
Realiz. 15 yrs	361	3 (0.8%)	25 (6.9%)	107 (29.6%)	149 (41.3%)	77 (21.3%)	32	4.0	1.00	3.75	0.90

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 58. S21 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	2.0 (1.00)	3.5 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.25)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.75)
Italy	47	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	4.0 (1.25)	4.5 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.25)	4.0 (2.00)
Portugal	38	5.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Poland	34	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	2.0 (1.75)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Germany	30	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	2.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)

S22 · Education and labour market policies will struggle to effectively govern young people's transition

Overall (N = 433):

Table 59. S22 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mea n	SD
Desirability	354	110 (31.1%)	127 (35.9%)	64 (18.1%)	28 (7.9%)	25 (7.1%)	39	2.0	2.0 0	2.24	1.18
Importance	366	7 (1.9%)	15 (4.1%)	90 (24.6%)	164 (44.8%)	90 (24.6%)	27	4.0	1.0 0	3.86	0.90
Conflict pot.	357	5 (1.4%)	33 (9.2%)	115 (32.2%)	156 (43.7%)	48 (13.4%)	36	4.0	1.0 0	3.58	0.89
Realiz. 5 yrs	358	5 (1.4%)	38 (10.6%)	139 (38.8%)	141 (39.4%)	35 (9.8%)	35	3.0	1.0 0	3.46	0.86
Realiz. 15 yrs	345	4 (1.2%)	32 (9.3%)	121 (35.1%)	135 (39.1%)	53 (15.4%)	48	4.0	1.0 0	3.58	0.90

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 60. S22 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	2.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.25)	3.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	3.0 (1.75)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Italy	47	2.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.50)	3.5 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Portugal	38	2.0 (1.75)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Poland	34	3.5 (2.75)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.25)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Germany	30	2.0 (2.25)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)

S23 · Integrated guidance centers for youth employment will be widely established

Overall (N = 433):

Table 61. S23 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mea n	SD
Desirability	368	2 (0.5%)	9 (2.4%)	50 (13.6%)	127 (34.5%)	180 (48.9%)	25	4.0	1.0 0	4.29	0.83
Importance	367	12 (3.3%)	32 (8.7%)	101 (27.5%)	138 (37.6%)	84 (22.9%)	26	4.0	1.0 0	3.68	1.02
Conflict pot.	351	40 (11.4%)	98 (27.9%)	104 (29.6%)	84 (23.9%)	25 (7.1%)	42	3.0	2.0 0	2.88	1.12
Realiz. 5 yrs	359	20 (5.6%)	75 (20.9%)	169 (47.1%)	69 (19.2%)	26 (7.2%)	34	3.0	2.0 0	3.02	0.96
Realiz. 15 yrs	351	11 (3.1%)	45 (12.8%)	138 (39.3%)	111 (31.6%)	46 (13.1%)	42	3.0	1.0 0	3.39	0.97

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 62. S23 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	2.0 (1.00)	3.0 (0.75)	3.0 (0.00)
Austria	58	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)

Italy	47	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.75)	4.0 (1.75)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.25)	4.0 (1.50)	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.50)
Portugal	38	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.25)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)
Poland	34	5.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	2.0 (1.50)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Germany	30	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.25)	4.0 (1.00)

3.4 Theme D: Inclusion and Disadvantage

Scale 1–5 per dimension. Desirability: 1 = Very undesirable ... 5 = Very desirable. Importance / Conflict / Realization: 1 = Very low ... 5 = Very high. Md = median, IQR = Q3 – Q1, CJ = "Cannot judge". % are of valid ratings.

S24 · Educational inequalities will exacerbate social polarization and segregation

Overall (N = 433):

Table 63. S24 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	400	289 (72.2%)	59 (14.8%)	24 (6.0%)	8 (2.0%)	20 (5.0%)	21	1.0	1.0 0	1.53	1.04
Importance	401	6 (1.5%)	20 (5.0%)	63 (15.7%)	141 (35.2%)	171 (42.6%)	20	4.0	1.0 0	4.12	0.95
Conflict pot.	397	2 (0.5%)	12 (3.0%)	44 (11.1%)	140 (35.3%)	199 (50.1%)	24	5.0	1.0 0	4.32	0.82
Realiz. 5 yrs	391	2 (0.5%)	27 (6.9%)	75 (19.2%)	173 (44.2%)	114 (29.2%)	30	4.0	2.0 0	3.95	0.90
Realiz. 15 yrs	379	1 (0.3%)	15 (4.0%)	77 (20.3%)	134 (35.4%)	152 (40.1%)	42	4.0	1.0 0	4.11	0.88

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 64. S24 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	2.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Italy	47	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (2.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	1.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	5.0 (1.00)
Portugal	38	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	1.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)
Poland	34	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.75)	4.0 (0.50)	4.0 (2.00)
Germany	30	1.0 (0.00)	4.5 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.50)	4.0 (2.00)

S25 · Resource inequities between public and private schools will widen

Overall (N = 433):

Table 65. S25 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	400	252 (63.0%)	89 (22.2%)	31 (7.8%)	10 (2.5%)	18 (4.5%)	21	1.0	1.0 0	1.63	1.04
Importance	391	15 (3.8%)	55 (14.1%)	89 (22.8%)	115 (29.4%)	117 (29.9%)	30	4.0	2.0 0	3.67	1.15

Conflict pot.	390	8 (2.1%)	34 (8.7%)	80 (20.5%)	136 (34.9%)	132 (33.8%)	31	4.0	2.0 0	3.90	1.03
Realiz. 5 yrs	382	11 (2.9%)	55 (14.4%)	88 (23.0%)	150 (39.3%)	78 (20.4%)	39	4.0	1.0 0	3.60	1.05
Realiz. 15 yrs	368	10 (2.7%)	40 (10.9%)	83 (22.6%)	109 (29.6%)	126 (34.2%)	53	4.0	2.0 0	3.82	1.10

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 66. S25 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Finland	71	1.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)	2.0 (1.50)	3.0 (2.00)
Austria	58	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.25)
Kosovo	55	2.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Italy	47	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	1.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	5.0 (1.00)
Portugal	38	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (0.75)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Poland	34	1.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Germany	30	1.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.50)	3.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.25)

S26 · Social class (socio-economic background) will continue to determine educational opportunities

Overall (N = 433):

Table 67. S26 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	409	276 (67.5%)	69 (16.9%)	33 (8.1%)	14 (3.4%)	17 (4.2%)	12	1.0	1.0 0	1.60	1.05
Importance	407	10 (2.5%)	34 (8.4%)	79 (19.4%)	136 (33.4%)	148 (36.4%)	14	4.0	2.0 0	3.93	1.05
Conflict pot.	404	2 (0.5%)	14 (3.5%)	65 (16.1%)	149 (36.9%)	174 (43.1%)	17	4.0	1.0 0	4.19	0.86
Realiz. 5 yrs	399	3 (0.8%)	22 (5.5%)	73 (18.3%)	173 (43.4%)	128 (32.1%)	22	4.0	1.0 0	4.00	0.89
Realiz. 15 yrs	383	2 (0.5%)	15 (3.9%)	69 (18.0%)	163 (42.6%)	134 (35.0%)	38	4.0	1.0 0	4.08	0.85

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 68. S26 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.50)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.50)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	2.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Italy	47	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	1.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)
Portugal	38	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.50)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Poland	34	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Germany	30	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.75)

S27 · Initiatives breaking gender stereotypes will open previously male-dominated career pathways to women

Overall (N = 433):

Table 69. S27 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	411	7 (1.7%)	7 (1.7%)	34 (8.3%)	82 (20.0%)	281 (68.4%)	10	5.0	1.00	4.52	0.85
Importance	404	13 (3.2%)	34 (8.4%)	102 (25.2%)	144 (35.6%)	111 (27.5%)	17	4.0	2.00	3.76	1.05
Conflict pot.	392	21 (5.4%)	62 (15.8%)	137 (34.9%)	120 (30.6%)	52 (13.3%)	29	3.0	1.00	3.31	1.06
Realiz. 5 yrs	400	17 (4.2%)	67 (16.8%)	165 (41.2%)	119 (29.8%)	32 (8.0%)	21	3.0	1.00	3.21	0.96
Realiz. 15 yrs	390	9 (2.3%)	39 (10.0%)	139 (35.6%)	135 (34.6%)	68 (17.4%)	31	4.0	1.00	3.55	0.97

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 70. S27 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	5.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.50)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.50)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Italy	47	5.0 (0.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	5.0 (0.50)	5.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Portugal	38	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.75)
the UK	36	5.0 (0.75)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Poland	34	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Germany	30	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.25)	3.5 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)

S28 · School system reliance on parental help will disadvantage non-native and low-education families

Overall (N = 433):

Table 71. S28 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	393	239 (60.8%)	82 (20.9%)	42 (10.7%)	16 (4.1%)	14 (3.6%)	28	1.0	1.00	1.69	1.05
Importance	394	11 (2.8%)	40 (10.2%)	79 (20.1%)	134 (34.0%)	130 (33.0%)	27	4.0	2.00	3.84	1.08
Conflict pot.	392	4 (1.0%)	12 (3.1%)	82 (20.9%)	158 (40.3%)	136 (34.7%)	29	4.0	1.25	4.05	0.88
Realiz. 5 yrs	386	5 (1.3%)	25 (6.5%)	86 (22.3%)	176 (45.6%)	94 (24.4%)	35	4.0	1.00	3.85	0.91
Realiz. 15 yrs	374	5 (1.3%)	20 (5.3%)	81 (21.7%)	157 (42.0%)	111 (29.7%)	47	4.0	2.00	3.93	0.92

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 72. S28 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
---------	---	--------------	------------	---------------	---------------	----------------

Total (all)	433	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.25)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Finland	71	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	1.0 (0.25)	4.0 (1.50)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Kosovo	55	2.0 (3.00)	4.0 (1.75)	4.0 (1.00)	3.5 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Italy	47	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	2.0 (2.00)	5.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Portugal	38	2.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.75)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.25)	4.0 (2.00)
Poland	34	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Germany	30	1.0 (0.00)	4.5 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.50)	4.0 (1.00)

S29 · Digital infrastructure and remote learning will reduce regional disparities between urban and rural education

Overall (N = 433):

Table 73. S29 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	388	8 (2.1%)	23 (5.9%)	81 (20.9%)	148 (38.1%)	128 (33.0%)	33	4.0	2.0 0	3.94	0.98
Importance	393	10 (2.5%)	45 (11.5%)	138 (35.1%)	124 (31.6%)	76 (19.3%)	28	4.0	1.0 0	3.54	1.01
Conflict pot.	378	25 (6.6%)	83 (22.0%)	148 (39.2%)	82 (21.7%)	40 (10.6%)	43	3.0	2.0 0	3.08	1.06
Realiz. 5 yrs	386	14 (3.6%)	76 (19.7%)	166 (43.0%)	98 (25.4%)	32 (8.3%)	35	3.0	1.0 0	3.15	0.95
Realiz. 15 yrs	376	10 (2.7%)	49 (13.0%)	123 (32.7%)	132 (35.1%)	62 (16.5%)	45	4.0	1.0 0	3.50	1.00

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 74. S29 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.5 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.50)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Italy	47	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	38	5.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Portugal	38	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (0.25)	3.0 (1.00)
Poland	34	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	2.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Germany	30	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (0.00)	3.5 (1.75)

S30 · Minority ethnic and racial groups of young people will face intensified discrimination

Overall (N = 433):

Table 75. S30 — Wave 1 rating distributions across the five dimensions (overall, N = 433)

Dimension	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Desirability	394	302 (76.6%)	39 (9.9%)	28 (7.1%)	14 (3.6%)	11 (2.8%)	27	1.0	0.0 0	1.46	0.97

Importance	394	11 (2.8%)	40 (10.2%)	81 (20.6%)	141 (35.8%)	121 (30.7%)	27	4.0	2.0 0	3.81	1.07
Conflict pot.	393	4 (1.0%)	21 (5.3%)	46 (11.7%)	138 (35.1%)	184 (46.8%)	28	4.0	1.0 0	4.21	0.92
Realiz. 5 yrs	384	5 (1.3%)	36 (9.4%)	102 (26.6%)	171 (44.5%)	70 (18.2%)	37	4.0	1.0 0	3.69	0.92
Realiz. 15 yrs	368	8 (2.2%)	34 (9.2%)	98 (26.6%)	151 (41.0%)	77 (20.9%)	53	4.0	1.0 0	3.69	0.97

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 76. S30 — Wave 1 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Desirability	Importance	Conflict pot.	Realiz. 5 yrs	Realiz. 15 yrs
Total (all)	433	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	71	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (2.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	58	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.5 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	55	2.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.75)	3.0 (2.00)
Italy	47	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.50)
Greece	38	1.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.75)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Portugal	38	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.75)	4.0 (1.00)
the UK	36	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Poland	34	1.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.75)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Germany	30	1.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.75)

4 Statement results — Wave 2 (final, N = 207)

Wave 2 fieldwork (LimeSurvey survey 534732) closed on 10 June 2026, 18:00. The figures below are based on the final Wave 2 analysis dataset: all 207 completed Wave 2 questionnaires (231 sessions started; no completed case removed in cleaning; see Section 1.1). Section 4 reports the Wave 2 results by block, Section 5 the Wave 1 ↔ Wave 2 comparison, and Section 6 the within-respondent (matched-sample) analyses.

Wave 2 is a targeted reassessment of the 21 carried-forward statements (codes identical to Wave 1), grouped into four blocks by their Wave 1 result pattern. The reassessment is block-specific: the set of rated dimensions differs by block, and Blocks 3 and 4 introduce new judgement dimensions not present in Wave 1. All dimensions use the same 1–5 scale (1 = Very low ... 5 = Very high) plus "Cannot judge".

- Block 1 (Controversial): all four Wave 1 dimensions — Importance, Conflict potential, Likelihood 5 yrs, Likelihood 15 yrs.
- Block 2 (Diverging): Importance and Likelihood within 5 years.
- Block 3 (Uncertain): two new items — agreement with the overall Wave 1 group assessment; certainty in one's own Wave 1 assessment.
- Block 4 (Consensus, optional deepening): one new item - feasibility of effective policy implementation.

Per-country breakdown. Wave 2 did not re-ask country of residence; each Wave 2 response was linked to its Wave 1 country via the respondent's individual survey token and email address, matched against the 433-case Wave 1 panel. Of 207 completed Wave 2 questionnaires, 205 were linked to a Wave 1 country; the remaining 2 are the cross-wave special cases described in the linkage note below (counted in the Wave 2 overall figures but not in a country column). The per-country tables cover the nine project countries; per-country n are small and should be read with caution.

4.1 Note on Wave 1 ↔ Wave 2 linkage

For the longitudinal linkage between Wave 1 and Wave 2, four special situations need to be acknowledged: (i) one respondent participated in both waves but could not be matched to a specific Wave 1 record, as they had not provided an email address or other identifying information when completing Wave 1; (ii) eight of the

nineteen respondents who completed Wave 1 only after the official end of the field phase (10 April 2026, 13:00) had nevertheless provided an email address and were therefore invited to Wave 2 — exactly one of them completed it. As their Wave 1 responses are excluded from the substantive Wave 1 analysis (which is restricted to completions within the regular field period), no longitudinal linkage of their Wave 1 and Wave 2 responses was carried out; their Wave 2 responses are included in the Wave 2 analysis as usual. (iii) One email address is attached to two complete Wave 1 records (two submissions, 19 minutes apart, from the same country); the corresponding Wave 2 respondent is counted in the per-country tables — the country is unambiguous — but excluded from the within-respondent analyses of Section 6. (iv) Two further Wave 1 records were identified post hoc as belonging to one respondent who had registered under two different email addresses; only one identity was invited to Wave 2 (and completed it). A sensitivity check excluding the duplicate record leaves all 150 reported Wave 1 medians unchanged and shifts three IQRs by at most a quarter scale point, with no change to any consensus reading; the Wave 1 dataset therefore remains as published (N = 433). In sum, 205 of the 207 completed Wave 2 questionnaires are linked to a Wave 1 record in the N = 433 dataset, and 204 respondents form the basis for the matched-sample analyses.

4.2 Block 1 — Controversial statements (re-rated on all four Wave 1 dimensions)

S02 · Illiteracy after eight or nine years of schooling will be the norm

Overall:

Table 77. S02 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Importance for policymakers	204	5 (2.5%)	14 (6.9%)	36 (17.6%)	73 (35.8%)	76 (37.3%)	3	4.0	2.0 0	3.99	1.02
Conflict potential for society	203	2 (1.0%)	15 (7.4%)	27 (13.3%)	89 (43.8%)	70 (34.5%)	4	4.0	1.0 0	4.03	0.93
Likelihood within 5 years	201	30 (14.9%)	63 (31.3%)	72 (35.8%)	32 (15.9%)	4 (2.0%)	6	3.0	1.0 0	2.59	0.99
Likelihood within 15 years	199	16 (8.0%)	54 (27.1%)	70 (35.2%)	38 (19.1%)	21 (10.6%)	8	3.0	2.0 0	2.97	1.10

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 78. S02 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Importance	Conflict pot.	Likelihood 5y	Likelihood 15y
Total (all)	207	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)
Finland	33	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	2.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Austria	35	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	2.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	26	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)
Italy	33	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (0.25)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	8	5.0 (1.00)	4.5 (1.00)	3.0 (0.25)	4.0 (1.50)
Portugal	17	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)
the UK	8	5.0 (0.25)	4.0 (0.25)	1.5 (1.00)	2.0 (0.25)
Poland	12	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	2.5 (1.25)	3.0 (2.00)
Germany	17	4.0 (1.00)	5.0 (1.00)	2.0 (1.25)	2.5 (1.00)

S07 · Focus on university education will neglect TVET (Technical and Vocational Education and Training)

Overall:

Table 79. S07 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Importance for policymakers	204	3 (1.5%)	22 (10.8%)	78 (38.2%)	77 (37.7%)	24 (11.8%)	3	3.0	1.0 0	3.48	0.89
Conflict potential for society	203	5 (2.5%)	24 (11.8%)	95 (46.8%)	64 (31.5%)	15 (7.4%)	4	3.0	1.0 0	3.30	0.86
Likelihood within 5 years	201	9 (4.5%)	39 (19.4%)	82 (40.8%)	62 (30.8%)	9 (4.5%)	6	3.0	1.0 0	3.11	0.92
Likelihood within 15 years	197	8 (4.1%)	36 (18.3%)	75 (38.1%)	54 (27.4%)	24 (12.2%)	10	3.0	1.0 0	3.25	1.02

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 80. S07 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Importance	Conflict pot.	Likelihood 5y	Likelihood 15y
Total (all)	207	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Finland	33	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	35	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (0.75)	3.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	26	3.0 (1.75)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Italy	33	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.25)	3.0 (1.25)
Greece	8	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.25)	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Portugal	17	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
the UK	8	4.0 (0.25)	3.0 (0.25)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Poland	12	3.0 (0.75)	3.0 (0.75)	3.0 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)
Germany	17	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.25)	3.0 (1.00)

4.3 Block 2 — Statements with diverging expert views (re-rated on Importance and Likelihood 5 yrs)

S01 · Double competencies (disciplinary plus IT) will become a universal employment requirement

Overall:

Table 81. S01 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Importance for policymakers	205	0 (0.0%)	7 (3.4%)	19 (9.3%)	118 (57.6%)	61 (29.8%)	2	4.0	1.0 0	4.14	0.71
Likelihood within 5 years	203	0 (0.0%)	6 (3.0%)	25 (12.3%)	102 (50.2%)	70 (34.5%)	4	4.0	1.0 0	4.16	0.75

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 82. S01 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Importance	Likelihood 5y
Total (all)	207	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	33	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	35	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	26	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Italy	33	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	8	4.5 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Portugal	17	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
the UK	8	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Poland	12	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Germany	17	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)

S05 · Public investment in early childhood education will become the most critical part of education

Overall:

Table 83. S05 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mea n	SD
Importance for policymakers	204	0 (0.0%)	10 (4.9%)	58 (28.4%)	68 (33.3%)	68 (33.3%)	3	4.0	2.0 0	3.95	0.90
Likelihood within 5 years	203	4 (2.0%)	29 (14.3%)	69 (34.0%)	64 (31.5%)	37 (18.2%)	4	3.0	1.0 0	3.50	1.01

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 84. S05 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Importance	Likelihood 5y
Total (all)	207	4.0 (2.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Finland	33	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Austria	35	5.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.75)
Kosovo	26	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Italy	33	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)
Greece	8	3.5 (1.25)	3.0 (1.25)
Portugal	17	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (2.00)
the UK	8	4.0 (0.00)	2.0 (1.00)
Poland	12	3.0 (1.25)	3.0 (1.25)
Germany	17	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.00)

S13 · Young people will be first to be fired and last to be hired during downturns

Overall:

Table 85. S13 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mea n	SD
Importance for policymakers	204	3 (1.5%)	12 (5.9%)	48 (23.5%)	93 (45.6%)	48 (23.5%)	3	4.0	1.0 0	3.84	0.90

Likelihood within 5 years	203	4 (2.0%)	14 (6.9%)	49 (24.1%)	97 (47.8%)	39 (19.2%)	4	4.0	1.0 0	3.75	0.91
---------------------------	-----	-------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---	-----	----------	------	------

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 86. S13 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Importance	Likelihood 5y
Total (all)	207	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	33	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	35	4.0 (1.50)	4.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	26	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Italy	33	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	8	4.0 (1.25)	3.5 (1.00)
Portugal	17	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (2.00)
the UK	8	4.5 (1.00)	4.0 (0.25)
Poland	12	3.0 (1.25)	4.0 (1.25)
Germany	17	4.0 (0.25)	4.0 (0.25)

S16 · Mental health challenges among youth stemming from the COVID-19 crisis will continue to affect life skills

Overall:

Table 87. S16 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Importance for policymakers	205	7 (3.4%)	17 (8.3%)	52 (25.4%)	83 (40.5%)	46 (22.4%)	2	4.0	1.0 0	3.70	1.02
Likelihood within 5 years	203	4 (2.0%)	20 (9.9%)	51 (25.1%)	95 (46.8%)	33 (16.3%)	4	4.0	1.0 0	3.66	0.93

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 88. S16 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Importance	Likelihood 5y
Total (all)	207	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	33	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	35	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	26	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Italy	33	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	8	3.5 (2.00)	4.0 (0.25)
Portugal	17	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.00)
the UK	8	5.0 (0.25)	4.0 (0.25)
Poland	12	4.0 (1.75)	4.0 (2.00)
Germany	17	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.00)

S17 · Media and Influencers will significantly influence student program choices

Overall:

Table 89. S17 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
--------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	-----	------	----

Importance for policymakers	207	3 (1.4%)	13 (6.3%)	61 (29.5%)	97 (46.9%)	33 (15.9%)	0	4.0	1.0 0	3.70	0.86
Likelihood within 5 years	206	1 (0.5%)	8 (3.9%)	34 (16.5%)	113 (54.9%)	50 (24.3%)	1	4.0	0.0 0	3.99	0.78

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 90. S17 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Importance	Likelihood 5y
Total (all)	207	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.00)
Finland	33	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	35	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	26	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Italy	33	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.00)
Greece	8	4.0 (1.00)	3.5 (1.00)
Portugal	17	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.00)
the UK	8	4.0 (0.50)	5.0 (1.00)
Poland	12	4.0 (0.25)	4.0 (1.00)
Germany	17	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.00)

S21 · Social partnerships between education, the private sector and academia will be widely formed

Overall:

Table 91. S21 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Importance for policymakers	205	5 (2.4%)	9 (4.4%)	42 (20.5%)	95 (46.3%)	54 (26.3%)	2	4.0	2.0 0	3.90	0.93
Likelihood within 5 years	205	0 (0.0%)	16 (7.8%)	77 (37.6%)	89 (43.4%)	23 (11.2%)	2	4.0	1.0 0	3.58	0.79

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 92. S21 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Importance	Likelihood 5y
Total (all)	207	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	33	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	35	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	26	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Italy	33	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	8	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.25)
Portugal	17	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
the UK	8	5.0 (0.25)	3.0 (1.25)
Poland	12	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Germany	17	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)

S23 · Integrated guidance centers for youth employment will be widely established

Overall:

Table 93. S23 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Importance for policymakers	204	3 (1.5%)	24 (11.8%)	73 (35.8%)	66 (32.4%)	38 (18.6%)	3	4.0	1.00	3.55	0.97
Likelihood within 5 years	202	7 (3.5%)	38 (18.8%)	99 (49.0%)	47 (23.3%)	11 (5.4%)	5	3.0	1.00	3.08	0.88

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 94. S23 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Importance	Likelihood 5y
Total (all)	207	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Finland	33	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Austria	35	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (0.75)
Kosovo	26	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Italy	33	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Greece	8	4.0 (2.00)	3.5 (1.00)
Portugal	17	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (0.25)
the UK	8	4.5 (2.00)	3.0 (2.00)
Poland	12	3.0 (2.25)	3.0 (1.00)
Germany	17	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)

S29 · Digital infrastructure and remote learning will reduce regional disparities between urban and rural education

Overall:

Table 95. S29 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Importance for policymakers	203	2 (1.0%)	12 (5.9%)	72 (35.5%)	89 (43.8%)	28 (13.8%)	4	4.0	1.00	3.64	0.83
Likelihood within 5 years	203	6 (3.0%)	22 (10.8%)	86 (42.4%)	75 (36.9%)	14 (6.9%)	4	3.0	1.00	3.34	0.87

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 96. S29 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Importance	Likelihood 5y
Total (all)	207	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Finland	33	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
Austria	35	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (0.00)
Kosovo	26	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Italy	33	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	8	4.0 (0.25)	4.0 (1.00)
Portugal	17	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)
the UK	8	4.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)

Poland	12	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (0.50)
Germany	17	4.0 (0.00)	3.0 (1.00)

4.4 Block 3 — Statements with expert uncertainty (new items: agreement with group result; own certainty)

S18 · The transition from education to employment will become more unstable and fragmented for many young people

Overall:

Table 97. S18 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Agreement with the overall Wave 1 group assessment	196	1 (0.5%)	8 (4.1%)	41 (20.9%)	90 (45.9%)	56 (28.6%)	11	4.0	2.0 0	3.98	0.84
Certainty in own Wave 1 assessment	182	1 (0.5%)	4 (2.2%)	43 (23.6%)	96 (52.7%)	38 (20.9%)	25	4.0	1.0 0	3.91	0.76

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 98. S18 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Agreement (W1 result)	Certainty (own W1)
Total (all)	207	4.0 (2.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	33	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	35	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.00)
Kosovo	26	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Italy	33	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	8	4.0 (0.50)	4.0 (0.25)
Portugal	17	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
the UK	8	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (0.00)
Poland	12	4.0 (0.75)	4.5 (1.00)
Germany	17	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.50)

S25 · Resource inequities between public and private schools will widen

Overall:

Table 99. S25 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Agreement with the overall Wave 1 group assessment	194	2 (1.0%)	19 (9.8%)	41 (21.1%)	86 (44.3%)	46 (23.7%)	13	4.0	1.0 0	3.80	0.95
Certainty in own Wave 1 assessment	177	1 (0.6%)	10 (5.6%)	42 (23.7%)	91 (51.4%)	33 (18.6%)	30	4.0	1.0 0	3.82	0.82

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 100. S25 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Agreement (W1 result)	Certainty (own W1)
Total (all)	207	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	33	3.0 (1.00)	3.0 (1.00)

Austria	35	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	26	3.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Italy	33	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.75)
Greece	8	4.5 (1.25)	4.5 (1.00)
Portugal	17	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.00)
the UK	8	4.0 (0.75)	3.5 (1.00)
Poland	12	4.0 (1.50)	4.0 (0.75)
Germany	17	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (0.50)

S28 · School system reliance on parental help will disadvantage non-native and low-education families

Overall:

Table 101. S28 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Agreement with the overall Wave 1 group assessment	195	1 (0.5%)	3 (1.5%)	30 (15.4%)	88 (45.1%)	73 (37.4%)	12	4.0	1.0 0	4.17	0.78
Certainty in own Wave 1 assessment	180	1 (0.6%)	2 (1.1%)	32 (17.8%)	86 (47.8%)	59 (32.8%)	27	4.0	1.0 0	4.11	0.77

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 102. S28 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Agreement (W1 result)	Certainty (own W1)
Total (all)	207	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	33	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.00)
Austria	35	4.0 (1.75)	4.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	26	4.0 (1.50)	4.0 (1.00)
Italy	33	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	8	5.0 (1.00)	5.0 (0.25)
Portugal	17	4.0 (1.00)	4.0 (0.50)
the UK	8	4.0 (0.00)	4.0 (0.50)
Poland	12	4.0 (1.00)	4.5 (1.00)
Germany	17	5.0 (1.00)	4.0 (1.00)

4.5 Block 4 — Consensus statements, optional deepening (new item: feasibility of policy implementation)

S03 · The COVID-19 crisis will have long-term impacts on learning behaviour and abilities for young people

Overall:

Table 103. S03 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Feasibility of effective policy implementation	190	4 (2.1%)	21 (11.1%)	69 (36.3%)	74 (38.9%)	22 (11.6%)	17	4.0	1.0 0	3.47	0.91

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 104. S03 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Feasibility
Total (all)	207	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	33	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	35	3.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	26	4.0 (1.00)
Italy	33	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	8	4.0 (1.25)
Portugal	17	3.0 (1.00)
the UK	8	3.0 (0.00)
Poland	12	3.0 (1.00)
Germany	17	4.0 (1.00)

S04 · Schools will implement effective programs to address behavioral problems (e.g.: violence, bullying, disengagement)

Overall:

Table 105. S04 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mea n	SD
Feasibility of effective policy implementation	201	1 (0.5%)	14 (7.0%)	55 (27.4%)	89 (44.3%)	42 (20.9%)	6	4.0	1.0 0	3.78	0.87

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 106. S04 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Feasibility
Total (all)	207	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	33	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	35	4.0 (1.75)
Kosovo	26	4.0 (1.00)
Italy	33	4.0 (1.50)
Greece	8	4.5 (1.00)
Portugal	17	4.0 (0.00)
the UK	8	4.0 (1.00)
Poland	12	4.0 (2.00)
Germany	17	4.0 (0.00)

S09 · New career entry pathways will emerge as AI transforms traditional employment routes

Overall:

Table 107. S09 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mea n	SD
Feasibility of effective policy implementation	199	1 (0.5%)	12 (6.0%)	47 (23.6%)	94 (47.2%)	45 (22.6%)	8	4.0	1.0 0	3.85	0.86

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 108. S09 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Feasibility
---------	---	-------------

Total (all)	207	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	33	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	35	4.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	26	4.0 (1.75)
Italy	33	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	8	4.5 (1.00)
Portugal	17	4.0 (0.00)
the UK	8	3.0 (1.00)
Poland	12	4.0 (1.00)
Germany	17	3.5 (1.00)

S12 · Lack of affordable childcare will prevent young parents' labor participation

Overall:

Table 109. S12 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Feasibility of effective policy implementation	200	4 (2.0%)	13 (6.5%)	38 (19.0%)	90 (45.0%)	55 (27.5%)	7	4.0	2.00	3.90	0.95

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 110. S12 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Feasibility
Total (all)	207	4.0 (2.00)
Finland	33	4.0 (0.00)
Austria	35	4.0 (2.00)
Kosovo	26	4.0 (2.00)
Italy	33	4.0 (0.75)
Greece	8	5.0 (1.00)
Portugal	17	4.0 (1.00)
the UK	8	4.0 (1.25)
Poland	12	4.0 (1.25)
Germany	17	4.0 (1.00)

S14 · The gap between employer expectations for skilled workers and employer participation in training provision will widen

Overall:

Table 111. S14 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Feasibility of effective policy implementation	191	2 (1.0%)	17 (8.9%)	71 (37.2%)	76 (39.8%)	25 (13.1%)	16	4.0	1.00	3.55	0.87

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 112. S14 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Feasibility
Total (all)	207	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	33	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	35	3.0 (1.00)

Kosovo	26	4.0 (1.00)
Italy	33	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	8	4.5 (1.25)
Portugal	17	3.0 (1.00)
the UK	8	4.0 (1.00)
Poland	12	3.0 (1.00)
Germany	17	3.0 (1.00)

S20 · Schools will increasingly adapt curricula to emerging occupations and career paths

Overall:

Table 113. S20 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Feasibility of effective policy implementation	199	2 (1.0%)	8 (4.0%)	59 (29.6%)	94 (47.2%)	36 (18.1%)	8	4.0	1.0 0	3.77	0.83

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 114. S20 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Feasibility
Total (all)	207	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	33	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	35	4.0 (1.25)
Kosovo	26	4.0 (1.75)
Italy	33	4.0 (1.00)
Greece	8	4.0 (1.00)
Portugal	17	4.0 (1.00)
the UK	8	4.0 (1.00)
Poland	12	4.0 (1.00)
Germany	17	4.0 (1.00)

S24 · Educational inequalities will exacerbate social polarization and segregation

Overall:

Table 115. S24 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Feasibility of effective policy implementation	194	5 (2.6%)	7 (3.6%)	49 (25.3%)	80 (41.2%)	53 (27.3%)	13	4.0	2.0 0	3.87	0.94

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 116. S24 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Feasibility
Total (all)	207	4.0 (2.00)
Finland	33	4.0 (1.00)
Austria	35	4.0 (2.00)
Kosovo	26	4.0 (1.75)
Italy	33	4.0 (0.50)
Greece	8	4.5 (1.00)

Portugal	17	4.0 (1.00)
the UK	8	3.0 (0.75)
Poland	12	3.0 (1.50)
Germany	17	4.0 (0.00)

S27 · Initiatives breaking gender stereotypes will open previously male-dominated career pathways to women

Overall:

Table 117. S27 — Wave 2 reassessment, overall (final, N = 207)

Dimension (Wave 2)	n	1	2	3	4	5	CJ	Md	IQR	Mean	SD
Feasibility of effective policy implementation	201	5 (2.5%)	18 (9.0%)	68 (33.8%)	87 (43.3%)	23 (11.4%)	6	4.0	1.0 0	3.52	0.90

By project country — median (IQR):

Table 118. S27 — Wave 2 median (IQR) by project country

Country	n	Feasibility
Total (all)	207	4.0 (1.00)
Finland	33	3.0 (1.00)
Austria	35	3.0 (1.00)
Kosovo	26	4.0 (1.00)
Italy	33	3.0 (1.00)
Greece	8	4.0 (1.25)
Portugal	17	4.0 (1.00)
the UK	8	4.0 (0.50)
Poland	12	4.0 (1.00)
Germany	17	4.0 (1.00)

4.6 Contributing factors and policy measures (multiple-choice)

Wave 2 final (N = 207). For every statement, respondents could select, in two "select all that apply" items, which types of factors might contribute to the trend and which types of policy measures are most needed. Cells are the % of respondents who answered the item (base n shown); the option sets are identical across statements. PNS = "prefer not to say / cannot judge"; Other = count of free-text answers. The open "biggest risk" text field is qualitative and is documented in the Qualitative Volume.

Contributing factors — "what type of factors might contribute to this trend?" (% of respondents).

F1 = Structural features of population and society

F2 = Policy frameworks and regulations

F3 = Market dynamics and economic conditions

F4 = Technological change and digitalisation

F5 = Social and cultural shifts

F6 = Institutional practices and organisational capacities of education and training institutions

F7 = Individual behaviour and choices of young people and their families

Table 119. Contributing factors F1–F7 by statement (% selecting; Wave 2, N = 207)

Statement	base	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	PNS	Other
S01 Double competencies (d...	207	14	18	74	92	32	29	10	0	2
S02 Illiteracy after eight...	207	40	28	14	61	49	42	30	1	11
S03 The COVID-19 crisis wi...	207	29	20	19	35	44	42	38	8	4
S04 Schools will implement...	207	26	50	5	15	51	66	33	3	3
S05 Public investment in e...	207	57	51	19	14	57	40	18	2	6

S07 Focus on university ed...	207	25	46	37	33	42	35	40	1	8
S09 New career entry pathw...	207	11	19	70	84	36	25	15	1	3
S12 Lack of affordable chi...	207	44	55	53	9	37	21	21	3	5
S13 Young people will be f...	207	38	43	83	32	25	19	12	2	2
S14 The gap between employ...	207	22	25	65	45	26	35	10	6	3
S16 Mental health challeng...	207	37	16	21	34	56	32	44	6	8
S17 Media and Influencers ...	207	24	8	33	63	72	13	55	1	5
S18 The transition from ed...	207	29	25	78	51	38	26	23	1	3
S20 Schools will increasin...	207	16	42	53	58	26	53	6	1	2
S21 Social partnerships be...	207	16	51	68	42	21	65	3	2	3
S23 Integrated guidance ce...	207	29	59	50	23	28	48	17	1	4
S24 Educational inequaliti...	207	51	30	48	29	58	23	25	2	2
S25 Resource inequities be...	207	29	53	48	18	34	42	25	1	3
S27 Initiatives breaking g...	207	36	39	25	15	73	33	29	4	1
S28 School system reliance...	207	55	35	24	14	53	43	29	2	3
S29 Digital infrastructure...	207	29	33	25	76	34	48	18	2	4

Policy measures — "what type of policy measures are most needed in response?" (% of respondents).

P1 = Regulation and legislation

P2 = Funding and financial incentives

P3 = Investment in education, training and skills development

P4 = Support and counselling services for individuals

P5 = Cross-sector partnerships and stakeholder engagement

P6 = Research, monitoring and evidence-building

P7 = Awareness raising and information campaigns

Table 120. Policy measures P1–P7 by statement (% selecting; Wave 2, N = 207)

Statement	base	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	PNS	Other
S01 Double competencies (d...	207	27	36	83	22	41	29	21	0	3
S02 Illiteracy after eight...	207	28	26	88	39	19	37	30	0	6
S03 The COVID-19 crisis wi...	207	15	21	67	60	17	36	31	5	3
S04 Schools will implement...	207	40	24	62	48	21	25	48	3	1
S05 Public investment in e...	207	42	48	76	20	19	22	24	2	4
S07 Focus on university ed...	207	26	41	71	29	40	26	32	2	5
S09 New career entry pathw...	207	42	22	72	29	37	37	18	2	3
S12 Lack of affordable chi...	207	59	70	48	20	26	12	13	2	2
S13 Young people will be f...	207	56	45	52	26	34	18	18	2	6
S14 The gap between employ...	207	31	43	62	20	50	19	18	6	1
S16 Mental health challeng...	207	12	14	48	76	27	33	44	2	8
S17 Media and Influencers ...	207	21	10	50	63	21	29	69	1	3
S18 The transition from ed...	207	29	37	66	51	44	19	19	2	3
S20 Schools will increasin...	207	40	32	75	13	43	42	14	0	5
S21 Social partnerships be...	207	44	46	59	4	69	27	14	2	5
S23 Integrated guidance ce...	207	41	49	52	38	45	15	21	3	0
S24 Educational inequaliti...	207	43	40	77	29	20	26	28	3	1
S25 Resource inequities be...	207	49	59	73	10	21	19	12	3	3
S27 Initiatives breaking g...	207	41	22	45	31	23	25	57	5	5
S28 School system reliance...	207	38	39	65	51	23	18	29	3	0
S29 Digital infrastructure...	207	34	52	74	16	30	22	19	4	1

5 Wave 1 ↔ Wave 2 comparison

The comparison covers only dimensions measured in both waves: all four dimensions for Block 1, and Importance and Likelihood 5 yrs for Block 2. Blocks 3 and 4 use new Wave 2 judgement dimensions

(agreement, certainty, feasibility) without a Wave 1 counterpart and therefore appear in Section 4 only. Δ Md = Wave 2 minus Wave 1 median; Δ IQR = Wave 2 minus Wave 1 IQR (a negative Δ IQR indicates convergence toward consensus). Across the 24 comparable pairs, the IQR narrowed in 9, was unchanged in 15 and widened in none; the median shifted in 1 of the 24 (the five-year likelihood of S21, upward).

5.1 Block 1 — Controversial statements (re-rated on all four Wave 1 dimensions)

Table 121. Wave 1 ↔ Wave 2 comparison — Block 1 (controversial statements), medians and IQRs

Code	Dimension	W1 Md	W1 IQR	W2 Md	W2 IQR	Δ Md	Δ IQR
S02	Importance for policymakers	4.0	2.00	4.0	2.00	+0.0	+0.00
S02	Conflict potential for society	4.0	2.00	4.0	1.00	+0.0	-1.00
S02	Likelihood within 5 years	3.0	1.50	3.0	1.00	+0.0	-0.50
S02	Likelihood within 15 years	3.0	2.00	3.0	2.00	+0.0	+0.00
S07	Importance for policymakers	3.0	1.00	3.0	1.00	+0.0	+0.00
S07	Conflict potential for society	3.0	1.00	3.0	1.00	+0.0	+0.00
S07	Likelihood within 5 years	3.0	2.00	3.0	1.00	+0.0	-1.00
S07	Likelihood within 15 years	3.0	2.00	3.0	1.00	+0.0	-1.00

5.2 Block 2 — Statements with diverging expert views (re-rated on Importance and Likelihood 5 yrs)

Table 122. Wave 1 ↔ Wave 2 comparison — Block 2 (diverging statements), medians and IQRs

Code	Dimension	W1 Md	W1 IQR	W2 Md	W2 IQR	Δ Md	Δ IQR
S01	Importance for policymakers	4.0	2.00	4.0	1.00	+0.0	-1.00
S01	Likelihood within 5 years	4.0	1.00	4.0	1.00	+0.0	+0.00
S05	Importance for policymakers	4.0	2.00	4.0	2.00	+0.0	+0.00
S05	Likelihood within 5 years	3.0	2.00	3.0	1.00	+0.0	-1.00
S13	Importance for policymakers	4.0	1.00	4.0	1.00	+0.0	+0.00
S13	Likelihood within 5 years	4.0	1.00	4.0	1.00	+0.0	+0.00
S16	Importance for policymakers	4.0	1.50	4.0	1.00	+0.0	-0.50
S16	Likelihood within 5 years	4.0	1.00	4.0	1.00	+0.0	+0.00
S17	Importance for policymakers	4.0	1.00	4.0	1.00	+0.0	+0.00
S17	Likelihood within 5 years	4.0	1.00	4.0	0.00	+0.0	-1.00
S21	Importance for policymakers	4.0	2.00	4.0	2.00	+0.0	+0.00
S21	Likelihood within 5 years	3.0	1.00	4.0	1.00	+1.0	+0.00
S23	Importance for policymakers	4.0	1.00	4.0	1.00	+0.0	+0.00
S23	Likelihood within 5 years	3.0	2.00	3.0	1.00	+0.0	-1.00
S29	Importance for policymakers	4.0	1.00	4.0	1.00	+0.0	+0.00
S29	Likelihood within 5 years	3.0	1.00	3.0	1.00	+0.0	+0.00

Blocks 3 and 4: no Wave 1 ↔ Wave 2 comparison — the Wave 2 items (agreement, certainty, feasibility) are new reassessment dimensions; their final results are in Section 4. Section 5.3 adds the per-country reading of the comparison; Section 6 follows the same respondents across the two waves.

5.3 Per-country convergence

The same Wave 1 ↔ Wave 2 comparison can be read per project country: for each of the 24 statement × dimension pairs of Blocks 1 and 2, the country-specific IQR is computed within the country subsample of each wave (Wave 1: the country panels of the N = 433 dataset; Wave 2: the linked respondents of that country) and the change is recorded. Country panels are small in Wave 2 (n between 8 and 35), so these figures describe tendencies rather than precise estimates and should be read with caution. The pattern is nevertheless uniform in direction: the mean Δ IQR is negative in all nine project countries — strongest in Germany (−0.56), Greece (−0.55) and Portugal (−0.45), weakest in Poland (−0.10), where narrowing and widening pairs balance (8 vs 8). “Share narrowed” is the share of the 24 pairs with a narrower Wave 2 IQR.

Table 123. Per-country convergence across the 24 comparable statement × dimension pairs

Country	Wave 2 n	Pairs compared	IQR narrowed	IQR unchanged	IQR widened	Share narrowed	Mean Δ IQR
Finland	33	24	6	16	2	25%	-0.23
Austria	35	24	10	12	2	42%	-0.27
Kosovo	26	24	6	15	3	25%	-0.21
Italy	33	24	7	13	4	29%	-0.21
Greece	8	24	16	5	3	67%	-0.55
Portugal	17	24	12	10	2	50%	-0.45
the UK	8	24	12	7	5	50%	-0.39
Poland	12	24	8	8	8	33%	-0.10
Germany	17	24	14	8	2	58%	-0.56

6 Matched-sample analyses (within-respondent change)

Because each Wave 2 response carries the respondent's individual survey token, Wave 2 cases can be linked back to their own Wave 1 records (via the email address registered with the token and the email address provided in Wave 1). 205 of the 207 completed Wave 2 questionnaires were linked to a Wave 1 record in the N = 433 analysis dataset (Section 4.0). For the within-respondent analyses below, one further case was set aside: one email address is attached to two Wave 1 records, so the corresponding Wave 2 case cannot be attributed to a unique Wave 1 record (Section 4.0, case iii). This leaves 204 linked respondents, of whom 202 provided at least one pair of substantive ratings (1–5 in both waves) on a re-rated dimension, contributing 4,419 rating pairs across the 24 statement × dimension combinations of Blocks 1 and 2. Each pair is classified by its distance to the Wave 1 group median of the respective dimension: unchanged; moved toward the group median; moved away from it; or changed to a value equally distant on the opposite side (equidistant flip).

Within-respondent movement is modest in size but clearly directed. 40.6% of all rating pairs are identical across waves, 83.8% lie within one scale point, and the mean absolute change is 0.79 scale points. Of all pairs, 30.6% moved toward the Wave 1 group median, 22.4% moved away and 6.4% are equidistant flips — movement toward the panel view thus clearly outweighs movement away from it. At the same time, revision is the norm at the level of individuals: every one of the 202 respondents changed at least one rating, and the median respondent changed 59% of their comparable ratings. The aggregate stability documented in Section 5 is therefore not inertia: it is the net result of widespread individual revision that, on balance, pulls toward the panel view — exactly the mechanism a Delphi is designed to elicit.

The pull toward the group view is strongest for the conflict-potential rating of S02 (63 moves toward vs 31 away) and the importance and five-year-likelihood ratings of S01. The five-year likelihood of S05 is the one dimension where moves away from the Wave 1 median outnumber moves toward it (67 vs 51); these moves are overwhelmingly upward (mean change +0.39) — the panel leans toward a higher likelihood without moving the group median. The same upward pressure did shift the group median for S21 (3.0 → 4.0).

Table 124. Matched-sample movement by statement × dimension (within-respondent change, final)

Code	Dimension	Rating pairs (n)	Unchanged (%)	Toward group median (%)	Away from group median (%)	Equidistant flips (%)	Mean change (W2 – W1)
S02	Importance for policymakers	184	35.3	33.2	22.8	8.7	+0.24
S02	Conflict potential for society	186	42.5	33.9	16.7	7.0	+0.19
S02	Likelihood within 5 years	180	43.3	32.2	19.4	5.0	-0.05
S02	Likelihood within 15 years	177	39.0	33.3	22.0	5.6	+0.11

S07	Importance for policymakers	193	39.9	28.5	23.8	7.8	+0.11
S07	Conflict potential for society	187	41.2	33.7	19.3	5.9	-0.03
S07	Likelihood within 5 years	187	41.2	28.9	23.0	7.0	+0.02
S07	Likelihood within 15 years	181	40.3	26.5	27.6	5.5	+0.14
S01	Importance for policymakers	192	44.3	32.8	17.2	5.7	+0.08
S01	Likelihood within 5 years	190	39.5	32.1	16.8	11.6	+0.56
S05	Importance for policymakers	197	39.1	32.0	18.8	10.2	+0.17
S05	Likelihood within 5 years	190	31.1	26.8	35.3	6.8	+0.39
S13	Importance for policymakers	185	41.1	32.4	22.7	3.8	+0.17
S13	Likelihood within 5 years	184	42.4	32.1	21.7	3.8	+0.21
S16	Importance for policymakers	179	43.6	31.3	20.7	4.5	+0.04
S16	Likelihood within 5 years	174	49.4	24.1	20.7	5.7	-0.07
S17	Importance for policymakers	178	43.8	29.8	21.3	5.1	+0.01
S17	Likelihood within 5 years	177	51.4	26.0	19.2	3.4	+0.02
S21	Importance for policymakers	182	42.3	29.7	23.1	4.9	-0.09
S21	Likelihood within 5 years	180	37.8	28.3	26.7	7.2	+0.16
S23	Importance for policymakers	179	34.6	26.8	30.7	7.8	-0.21
S23	Likelihood within 5 years	176	42.6	29.5	23.3	4.5	+0.06
S29	Importance for policymakers	191	35.6	37.2	22.0	5.2	+0.01
S29	Likelihood within 5 years	190	34.7	31.6	24.2	9.5	+0.14

Note: percentages are shares of the rating pairs in the respective row; rows are the same 24 statement × dimension combinations as in Sections 5.1 and 5.2. The matched analysis file combining both waves at respondent level is prepared and maintained separately by the UNI BA data team; the figures in this section are computed directly from the raw response exports of the two waves.